R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 019 939 JC 680 182

FOCUS ON LEARNING--PREPARING TEACHERS FOR THE TWO-YEAR COLLEGE.

BY- COHEN, ARTHUR M. BRAWER, FLORENCE B.
CALIFORNIA UNIV., LOS ANGELES

REPORT NUMBER UCLA-JCLP-OR-11 PUB DATE MAR 68
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$2.72 66P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *COLLEGE TEACHERS, *TEACHER EDUCATION, TEACHER EDUCATION CURRICULUM, *INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS, *PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS, PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, PROGRAM EVALUATION,

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE TEACHER INTERNSHIP PROGRAM AT UCLA HAS BEEN DESIGNED TO PRODUCE LEARNING SPECIALISTS, AND ALL PHASES OF THE PROGRAM ARE INTENDED TO DEVELOP THE INTERN'S ABILITY TO SPECIFY OBJECTIVES, TO SELECT APPROPRIATE MEDIA, AND TO GATHER AND EVALUATE EVIDENCE OF LEARNING. IN THE SUMMER BEFORE HE BEGINS TEACHING, EACH INTERN ENROLLS IN A COURSE ENTITLED "THE JUNIOR COLLEGE CURRICULUM", HE PARTICIPATES IN A SEMINAR DURING HIS FIRST SEMESTER OF TEACHING, AND, IN THE FOLLOWING SEMESTER, HE ATTENDS VARIOUS TYPES OF GROUP SESSIONS WITH TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS. THE CURRICULUM COURSE SERVES AS BOTH COURSE AND MODEL, WITH UNITS DESIGNED TO LEAD INTERNS TO THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE COURSES THEY WILL TEACH. THE MONOGRAPH INCLUDES DESCRIPTIONS OF THE CURRICULUM COURSE, CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PROGRAM'S FIRST 46 INTERNS, SELECTION PROCEDURES, EVALUATIONS OF THE INTERNS' PROGRESS, AND THE INTERNS' EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM. THIS DOCUMENT IS ALSO AVAILABLE FOR $2.00 FROM THE UCLA STUDENTS' STORE, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES 90024. (WO)

ERIC

ED019979

FOCUS ON LEARNING: PREPARING TEACHERS FOR THE TWO-YEAR COLLEGE

UNIVERSITY of CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

APR 25 1968

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE

TC 680182

OCCASIONAL REPORT FROM U C L A JUNIOR COLLEGE LEADERSHIP PROGRAM / NUMBER 11

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FOCUS ON LEARNING: PREPARING TEACHERS FOR THE TWO-YEAR COLLEGE

by

ARTHUR M. COHEN

in collaboration with

FLORENCE B. BRAWER

Occasional Report Number 11

JUNIOR COLLEGE LEADERSHIP PROGRAM
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

March 1968

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED
BY JOHN GOODLAD (EDUC.-UCLA) FOR
REGENTS OF UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING
UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF
EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE
THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF
THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

© 1968 BY THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CONTENTS

FOREWORD 5

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS 7

CHAPTER I.

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE AND ITS FACULTY 9
Junior College Teacher Preparation 10

CHAPTER II.

ORGANIZATION OF THE UCLA PROGRAM 15
The Teaching Internship 16
Recruitment and Selection 17
Placement 19

CHAPTER III.

RATIONALE AND PRACTICE 21
Limitations on Program Design 22
Rationale 24

CHAPTER IV.

THE CORE COURSE 27
Goals and Objectives 28
The Junior College Curriculum Course 29
Sequence of Objectives 32
The First Semester 32
The Second Semester Meetings 33

CHAPTER V.

THE INTERNS 35
Selection 36
Academic Backgrounds 37
Academic Majors 37
Honorary Organizations 39
Age and Sex 41
Work Experience 41
City Examination Placements 43

Holding Power 43
Comments 44

CHAPTER VI.

SUMMARY AND CRITIQUE 49
History and Rationale 49
Professional Preparation 50
Problems 52
Leadership Provision 53
Research and Lines of Influence 53
Theory into Practice 54
Defined Roles of the Junior College 56

APPENDIX

DEFINING GOALS AND OBJECTIVES 61

BIBLIOGRAPHY 67

FOREWORD

A study of the "critical problems and needs of California Junior Colleges"—sometimes referred to as the "Peterson Study"—in 1965 found that the problem and need which ranked first in importance was "the effectiveness and improvement of instruction."[1] This monograph and the program of teacher preparation which it reports contribute to meeting the need identified in the "Peterson Study."

The effective preparation of junior college teachers clearly contributes to the improvement of instruction—and, more importantly, as Dr. Cohen would point out, to the increase of student learning in the two-year college. The number of junior college teachers who are prepared at UCLA is not large. The care with which they are selected and the nature of their preparation are such, however, that their contributions to improved learning will, it is anticipated, far exceed those which would be expected on the basis of their numbers.

The internship plan here described involves junior college instructors and administrators in identifying instructional objectives, planning learning activities, and evaluating outcomes. The nature of this staff participation inevitably extends the influence of the program into sizable numbers of junior college classrooms—in addition to those in which interns may teach.

It is notable that, as the program becomes known, experienced administrators and instructors enroll in the basic course, *The Junior College Curriculum*, as an aid to improving their own leadership and teaching. During the summer of 1967, for example, the number of experienced personnel in *The Junior College Curriculum* exceeded the numbers of interns who were enrolled. From among these enrollees—and also from among the interns—a number of doctoral students will be selected. It is anticipated that these "doctors-to-be" will provide further leadership for the improvement of learning in the junior college.

This monograph appears at a particularly opportune time. In California—and in other parts of the nation—policies regarding the certification of junior college instructors are being reexamined and revised. As the junior college is increasingly recognized as an institution of higher education, there is a trend toward eliminating requirements for the certification of junior college instructors. Faculty members may be appointed solely on the basis of their academic preparation in their field of teaching. As a consequence, graduate students planning to teach in two-year colleges will enroll in courses in junior college teaching—

[1] Basil H. Peterson, "Critical Problems and Needs of California Junior Colleges" (Committee on Institutional Research, California Junior College Association, mimeo., 1965), p. 26.

not because they are required to by law, but only because by doing so they will become better teachers and be placed in better positions.

This monograph will, it is hoped, contribute to the continuing development of improved programs of preparation for junior college teaching. Under present —and likely future—conditions, students will enroll only in programs of preparation which have demonstrated their value.

This publication is in part addressed to college and university professors and administrators who are responsible for programs of preparation for junior college instructors. It is also, however, addressed to "practitioners" in our junior colleges —administrators and teachers alike. Plans reported in these pages (including the Appendix, "Defining Goals and Objectives") for identifying objectives, planning learning activities, and evaluating outcomes have value not only in programs of teacher preparation but also in the totality of instruction in the junior college. As the practices reported and advocated in this publication are increasingly adopted in junior college classrooms, a contribution will have been made to meeting the first-ranking problem—the improvement of instruction, identified in the "Peterson Study."

B. LAMAR JOHNSON

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The success of most projects is due to the efforts of a number of people. Many contributed to the development of the program reported in this monograph and to the research conducted under its auspices.

Members of the UCLA Graduate School of Education Teacher Education Committee—particularly Professor John D. McNeil—helped initiate the Junior College Teaching Internship Program. The interns who participated in both the program's sequences and its research efforts were most cooperative in providing information about their backgrounds and their in-service teaching experiences. Richard Gillies and John Prihoda, UCLA teaching assistants, collected ratings from junior college supervisors. Wesley Jones of the Los Angeles City Schools provided information about placement examination results.

We are especially indebted to B. Lamar Johnson, Professor of Higher Education at UCLA, whose leadership has fostered the development of junior college programs at the University. This monograph incorporates many of his valuable ideas.

A. M. COHEN
F. B. BRAWER

CHAPTER I

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE AND ITS FACULTY

Within the vast empire that is the American educational system, the junior college has the distinction of being the fastest-growing force. Since its inception at the turn of the century, this institution has invented a mode of being which is patterned after no one particular structure. Instead, it has become a potpourri of educational opportunities, patterns, and programs—a catchall that is fast achieving an identity of its own.

Junior colleges take many forms. Some are under private control with curricula geared to specific programs; others, more often public, offer varied and comprehensive curricula. Some are parts of larger complexes of educational facilities; others exist as independent structures. Their offerings include courses designed for university transfer students, technical and vocational curricula, remedial and adult education, and a host of community service activities. Their diversity of commitments suggests an organizational capacity to change offerings in order to reflect varying needs of communities. Patterns, modes of organization, curricula, students, and staff differ. It is difficult to conceptualize a "typical" junior college.

In this vast and varied structure, several features may be seen as distinguishing the junior college from other forms and levels of education. It occupies a unique position between secondary and higher education, between instruction that is typically "student centered" and that which is more often oriented toward "content." In some cases the public community college may be a mere extension of the local high schools, a phenomenon that accounts for considerable confusion and difficulty in understanding the unique nature of the two-year college. More often and increasingly, however, it is separate from the high school and has its own governing board. Junior college student populations are usually much more heterogeneous than are those of the high school—their ages and abilities cover a wider range. Curricular offerings, too, are spread over a broader spectrum in the junior college, which provides specialized and advanced work and also offers programs for students of lesser ability. Compulsory public education is characteristic of the high school but nowhere is junior college education mandated. Community college students, drawn from a wide segment of the population, attend—not because they must but because they feel the institution offers something of value to them.

As the junior college differs from the high school, even the high school that in some cases shares its grounds and physical facilities, it also differs from the

four-year college and the university. Although the curricula of both organizations may be comprehensive, the junior college does not pursue specialties to the extent which is typical of senior institutions. It frequently treats a range of subject matter, but never are the programs as intensive as those found in larger four-year colleges. And they are, of course, considerably less intensive than those characteristic of universities which include graduate divisions.

The junior college is community centered, adapting its offerings to the changing needs of the area in which it is located. Local citizens are involved in planning and developing curricula, and community advisory boards influence junior college programs to a much greater extent than they do university curricula. The junior college is typically an "open-door college" admitting all high school graduates; universities, on the other hand, are usually selective of their students. Research designed to advance the frontiers of knowledge is one of the university's main functions; it occupies the time and effort of many people in the institution. The junior college may collect data and do some research, but this is geared to problems centering about its own personnel and therefore, it represents a minimal commitment.

The greatest overlap between the junior college and the university may be found in the preparation of freshmen and sophomores for upper-division work and in the adult-education programs. Many students transfer to senior institutions after initial junior college experiences; junior college offerings must, therefore, parallel lower-division university courses. Too, community college classes for adults frequently approximate university extension courses. In these two respects, curricula are similar.

Because it is more diverse in its student population and its curricular offerings than is secondary education, the junior college is not "high-school." Because it emphasizes teaching, not research, and offers wide varieties of programs designed to fit all the people of the community in which it is located, it is not "college." The junior college is a unique twentieth-century force, giving voice to the democratic ideal of education to the limit of any learner's ability to profit. This singular educational enterprise deserves uniquely prepared instructors.

JUNIOR COLLEGE TEACHER PREPARATION

Historically, the preparation of junior college instructors has been the function of liberal arts colleges and universities. Normal schools for teacher training arrived upon and left the American scene before the junior college movement got under way. Even teachers' colleges, successors to normal schools, lapsed into a minor role in the preparation of teachers prior to the full flowering of the junior college as an institution. Twentieth-century phenomenon that it is, the community college has been able to select its instructors almost exclusively from the ranks of the university and liberal arts college trained applicant.

In junior colleges around the country, the academic preparation of incoming teachers varies but slightly. The master's degree, whether required for certification or merely recommended in order to gain employment, is fairly well recognized as the preferred degree for junior college teaching. Somewhat more than two-thirds of all junior college instructors hold that degree—a figure which has

tended to increase slightly over the past ten years.[1] The per cent (less than ten) of instructors with the doctoral degree has remained steady and it is not likely to grow larger in the near future.[2] Teachers of "nonacademic" subjects (trade, technical, and vocational) do not typically hold graduate degrees. In their cases, equivalent experience in their specialty areas serves as requisite preparation.

Although most junior college instructors of academic subjects hold graduate degrees, there have been few university programs designed especially to prepare teachers for junior college instruction. Even the single course called "The Junior College" was until recently, a rarity. Fewer than a tenth of the practicing junior college teachers surveyed in 1949 had taken a "junior college" course.[3] In 1954, only twenty-three institutions offered one or more such courses.[4]

One major obstacle to the development of programs for training junior college teachers has been the fact that there is no clear-cut allocation of responsibility for the task.[5] Graduate schools have not been particularly concerned with the preparation of any type of college teacher, junior or senior. Typically, that function has been seen as a "total university commitment"—a shibboleth which, in practice, seems to indicate that it is no one's charge. Where university and college programs for preparing junior college instructors have existed, they have typically been organized on patterns similar to those used to prepare elementary and secondary school teachers. Although the entire institution has been ostensibly involved through its general educational offerings, the professional training aspects have been arranged through colleges, schools, or departments of education. Program integration is rarely seen.[6] The junior college course or program is still viewed largely as an adjunct to the main concerns of a teacher's preparation.

The paucity of programs can be further explained by the fact that junior colleges have been less concerned with the patterns of preparation enjoyed by their prospective teachers than with other matters. The junior college movement has expanded so rapidly that its administrators have been preoccupied with problems which appear to them to be much more pressing than their teachers' backgrounds. Buildings, finances, and people to handle in some fashion the flood of students have represented immediate concerns. The employment of teachers who had gained experience in classrooms at other levels of education has been seen as the quickest, surest way to build a faculty. A survey of California junior colleges taken in 1966 may serve to illustrate administrators' attitudes toward teacher preparation.[7] Of fifty-two presidents who responded to questions regard-

[1] James W. Thornton, *The Community Junior College*, 2nd ed. (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966), p. 136.
[2] Clyde E. Blocker, "Are Our Faculties Competent?" *Junior College Journal*, XXXVI, 4 (Dec. 1965), 12–17.
[3] Leonard V. Koos, "Preparation for Community College Teaching," *Journal of Higher Education*, XXI (June 1950), 309–317.
[4] C. C. Colvert and M. L. Baker, *The Status of College and University Offerings and Services in the Area of Junior College Education and Professional Upgrading of Junior College Faculty Members* (Austin, Tex.: Research Office, American Association of Junior Colleges, 1955).
[5] Russell M. Cooper, "The College Teaching Crisis," *Journal of Higher Education*, XXXV (Jan. 1964), 6–11.
[6] Leon N. Henderson, "An Internship in Junior College Teaching," *Junior College Journal*, XXVII, 7 (Mar. 1957), 388–395.
[7] Rio Hondo Junior College, "Summary of Replies to Questionnaire on Criteria for Employment of Junior College Teachers," May 13, 1966 (mimeo.).

ing standards for new faculty, only seven indicated they had criteria for employment "over and above minimum state requirements." State requirements included only a master's degree in the subject to be taught—with no courses in education required—or, for teachers of vocational subjects, "equivalent experience." Completion of particular preparation sequences was not seen as a potentially important part of the requirements. Those administrators who had established their own criteria indicated "successful teaching experience at the college or high school level" as being of prime importance.

Staffing the junior college primarily with secondary school teachers may be effective as a stop-gap measure, but the practice includes several drawbacks. In the first place, it does nothing to alleviate teacher shortages in general, since the teacher who comes into the junior college from a different segment of the educational field only leaves a vacancy in the institution from which he moves.[8] Furthermore, the high school teacher is rarely oriented to the unique characteristics of the junior college. He may view it as "Grades 13 and 14," or as the lower division of a university, and, in either case, he conducts himself in a manner inappropriate to the needs of the institution in which he labors. The junior college which continually fills its positions by employing local high school instructors may soon find creativity and receptiveness to new ideas lacking in its faculty. Inbreeding not infrequently breeds stultification.

Few currently practicing instructors learned about the junior college as part of their academic training. Fewer still were prepared for their positions in programs specifically designed for junior college teachers. They learned "Methods of Teaching in the Secondary School," if, indeed, they gained any pedagogical preparation at all. Even now, despite the maturity of the junior college itself, one finds in a university either a single "Director of Secondary and Junior College Teacher Preparation" or a division incorporating those two functions. Education courses are for students preparing to teach at any level of education, and student teaching and internship plans are frequently interchangeable between segments of the field. Most often, junior college instructors in preparation complete a master's degree in their field of teaching and take no work in education.[9]

There have been a few deliberate efforts to organize programs to prepare teachers especially for junior college work but, until recently, they were rarely found.[10] Nationwide, more than 64 per cent of 3,283 junior college teachers surveyed in 1960 reported previous secondary or elementary school experience.[11] As late as 1963, California—with the nation's largest, most comprehensive system of higher education—found that more than 300 of the 681 new teachers of academic subjects entering junior colleges moved in from high school positions. Only ninety-eight came directly from graduate school.[12]

---

[8] Thornton, p. 137.

[9] William G. Loomis, "A Study of the Formal Preparation of Academic Teachers in Community Colleges with Proposals for Oregon" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Oregon State University, 1965).

[10] Leonard V. Koos, "Programs of Junior College Teacher Preparation," *Junior College Journal*, XIX, 6 (Feb. 1949), 333–346.

[11] Leland Medsker, *The Junior College: Progress and Prospect* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1960), p. 172.

[12] California State Department of Education, "Summary of Source and Educational Background of New Teachers in California Junior Colleges 1963–64" (mimeo.).

But the pattern is gradually changing. Edmund J. Gleazer, Executive Director of the American Association of Junior Colleges, said recently, "Nationally, there is evidence that the public schools are providing a decreasing percentage of the new teachers in junior colleges, but the number coming directly from graduate school is rising."[13] His statement was corroborated by figures coming from Florida where, in 1964–65, 36 per cent of new teachers entered junior college teaching directly from graduate schools. Special preparation programs in California state colleges and universities have been successful in placing great numbers of their graduates in junior college positions. Perhaps, as junior college systems mature and become independent of local school districts, the trend may become stronger toward employing instructors who have been prepared especially to work in those institutions. Currently, more than two hundred colleges and universities indicate interest in preparing college teachers and many intend to establish programs especially designed for junior college instructors.[14]

This monograph describes the development of a program of junior college teacher preparation and the rationale on which it is based. It reports data on those people who have enrolled in the program and suggests future directions which the program is likely to take. As such, it may facilitate implementation of other sequences designed to prepare people specifically for junior college teaching. It is also anticipated that the plans here reported have implications for use by all junior college faculties as an aid to improving instruction.

[13] Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., "Preparation of Junior College Teachers," *Educational Record*, XLVIII (Spring 1967), 147–152.

[14] American Association of Junior Colleges, "A Supplementary Statement on the 'Education Professions Development' Program (April 19, 1967)" (mimeo.).

CHAPTER II

ORGANIZATION OF THE UCLA PROGRAM

In the early 1960's, a shortage of teachers loomed at all levels of higher education. The postwar baby boom had forced a bulge of students through elementary and secondary school. These students were approaching college age and it was expected that they would enter post-secondary education in great numbers, partly because the concurrent flourishing of the community college in America had put higher education within the reach of most of them, both geographically and financially. In vast numbers they took advantage of opportunities for further education.

One of the areas most affected by this deluge of students was Southern California, where forty-five junior colleges enrolled more than one-quarter million students. The surge of enrollments hit California in two ways—the baby boom plus postwar immigration, which served to make that state the most populous in the nation. Located in the center of this "hotbed" of junior college activity is the University of California, Los Angeles.

UCLA's interest in the community college movement has persisted for more than thirty-five years. A course in "The Junior College" has been offered continuously since 1931. Professors with particular interest in community colleges have been on the staff of the School of Education for an equal length of time and close ties have been maintained for many years between the School and area junior colleges. Since 1953, when students began doing practice teaching in local junior colleges on a regular basis, the UCLA School of Education has conducted a program particularly planned to prepare junior college teachers. Between 1953 and 1967, 408 students took one or more "junior college" courses at the University and gained practical experience as apprentice teachers.

A shift in the manner of preparing teachers was brought about by the development of a Junior College Teaching Internship Program. This program was stimulated by two foundation-subsidized projects: the Junior College Leadership Program and the Teacher Education Project. In 1960, a Junior College Leadership Program, directed by Professor B. Lamar Johnson, was organized at UCLA under a grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. Although the program's main emphasis was focused on the preparation of administrators for junior colleges, much interest in junior college teacher preparation was also maintained. Through the program's efforts and related activities, the School of Education "junior college" staff—professors with particular interest in the movement—was increased in number from one to the present staff of four.

A Teacher Education Project was organized at UCLA in 1962 with funds provided by the Ford Foundation, which, during the previous decade, had subsidized college teaching intern programs at twenty teacher training institutions.[1] Purposes of the project were to develop new modes of teacher preparation based on investigation of the most effective techniques. The project was designed to produce "a drastic shift" in all UCLA teacher preparation. Students who would eventually be in a position to change practices in schools were to be put in contact with innovative ideas in instruction. Academic training, not "methods," was to be emphasized. Teacher preparation was to be individualized and pointed toward creating teachers who would themselves be hypothesis makers and testers, not classroom methodologists.[2]

A sequence of preparation and a rationale on which the UCLA program would be based were developed between 1962 and 1967. It was decided early that the paid teaching internship was the preferred mode of preparation for teachers at all levels. Concurrently, the idea that teachers must be prepared to submit evidence that students have learned under their direction became the focus of the program. The following section describes the mechanics of the teaching internship program. The rationale on which it is based is developed more fully in Chapter III.

THE TEACHING INTERNSHIP

Designed to improve the preparation of teachers, internship programs are usually based on several principles, all revolving about the blending of theory and practice. They serve to move candidates into teaching in such a manner that they gain and incorporate valued techniques which they have tried in actual teaching situations. "Theory" courses are taken concurrently with teaching practice so that the two modes of conceptualizing education together influence the teacher's behavior. For that reason, internship programs should have definite foci. Purpose should be their overriding characteristic—purpose in course planning, purpose in sequencing, and purpose in defining specific objectives.

The internship approach differs from the "student-teaching" mode of training in several ways: An intern may be considered an advanced student teacher but he is paid by the district in which he teaches; the student teacher is not. The intern is considered a member of the school faculty; the student teacher is an apprentice. The intern is more likely to have completed his academic course work. He has much more latitude in preparing for and conducting his classes and, in most instances, he is less subject to immediate classroom supervision by a master teacher than is the student teacher. The intern is actually a teacher with a foot still in the university, whereas the student teacher is more like a graduate student with a foot in the schoolroom.

The UCLA Junior College Teaching Internship Program is based upon this

[1] John S. Diekhoff, *A Report of the College Faculty Internship Program* (New York: Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1961).

[2] Letter from Howard E. Wilson, Dean, UCLA School of Education, to Alvin Eurich, Ford Foundation, January 8, 1962. See also "The Re-Organization of Teacher Education at UCLA" (Los Angeles: University of California, School of Education, mimeo., June 23, 1961).

LEADERSHIP PROVISION

In an address to the faculty of the School of Education at UCLA on May 19, 1967, Chancellor Franklin D. Murphy asserted it was the function of the School to provide "intellectual leadership and innovative ideas" for the schools. The internship program represents an attempt to meet the Chancellor's charge. Formerly, junior college teacher preparation took the form of apprenticeship to a master teacher. Accordingly, the nature of preparation enjoyed by the instructor in training was almost impossible for the School of Education to control. Master teachers would provide experiences ranging from "Sit there and watch me and then do what I do" to "Take over the class and let me know if you have any problems." The idea that each teacher-in-preparation would find his own best way to cause learning if his attention were turned on that aspect of his work and if he were required to submit evidence of attainment represented a new thrust in the preparation of junior college teachers at UCLA.

Why should the University provide programs particularly designed for prospective junior college instructors? If junior college administrators are content to staff their institutions with former secondary school instructors or with master's degree holders who have had a "course or two in the junior college and some practice teaching," what is the purpose of the University's endeavor? The UCLA program is built upon the conviction that research on the effects of instruction is too important to be left to researchers who desperately trying to be "scientific," attempt to control all possible variables and thus find no significant difference in anything of importance. More importantly, many researchers consistently fail to apply their findings to actual teaching situations, and, if significant variables *are* discovered, years pass before they trickle down to the point at which they make an impact on classroom practice. The UCLA program is an experiment both in designing a plan for preparing teachers and in putting the design into practice. It is an attempt directly to influence procedures in the institutions it serves.

Will it matter? Will it make a difference to the junior college movement if greater proportions of its instructors come from programs in which they were prepared especially to teach—to cause learning? For a teacher preparation program to make an impact on instructional practices in the junior college, it must itself have more than a clear rationale. It must do more than turn the attention of a few neophyte teachers on the fact that they are supposed to cause students to change. The program itself must act as a change agent in the junior colleges it purports to serve.

RESEARCH AND LINES OF INFLUENCE

Investigations of interns' personality characteristics and the relationships among these variables and success in teaching are being conducted under auspices of the program. This line of investigation involves the interns as subjects for basic study of individual patterns of functioning and thus expands knowledge of people in transition from one role to another. The research, predicated upon dimensions of adaptability and flexibility, may eventually lead to a point at which more effective counseling of people may be undertaken. It

may also help in designing preparation and orientation sequences for people moving into teaching and other occupations.

Professors and doctoral students involved with the internship program study and help modify junior college instructional practices in many direct ways. Deans and division and department chairmen who participate in identifying and approving interns' teaching objectives are inevitably influenced—as upon occasion also are interns' teaching colleagues. As junior college administrators and instructors learn of the internship program and, particularly, of the course *The Junior College Curriculum*, many of them enroll in the course and participate in related activities at UCLA. In the summer of 1967, twenty-two instructors and administrators from seventeen high schools and junior colleges took the course. For the first time, experienced educators outnumbered the interns enrolled, a phenomenon which seems likely to be repeated in subsequent years. In the course, many instructors, forced for the first time to specify exactly what they are trying to do with their students, react with surprise. Representative of that effect is this comment by one instructor, "I have been teaching for twelve years but this course is really changing things for me. I'll never be the same. My professor asserts that if you want students to learn, a first step is to let them know what you expect them to learn. This is revolutionary!"

Other, more tangible effects of the program are apparent in changed procedures in junior colleges. The concept of "defined outcomes" as a basis for teaching practices is new to the two-year college and the internship program is helping to bring that rationale for instruction to those institutions. Course outlines modeled on those constructed by interns are in use by instructors in several area junior colleges. Supervision and evaluation of faculty members by assessing the nature and extent of learning achieved by their students is being introduced. These ideas were brought to the colleges through the program's efforts.

Research studies currently in progress or planned will consider effects of these changes. Mt. San Jacinto College, a local leader in defining outcomes for its courses, is being evaluated by a graduate student affiliated with the program.[3] Another study will establish guidelines for assessing effects of the UCLA and other programs for preparing junior college instructors.[4] Studies along similar lines are being developed.

THEORY INTO PRACTICE

It is difficult to select, from the realm of learning theory, direct connections with the internship program's emphasis on defined instructional outcomes. Cognitive, stimulus-response, and personality theories all include elements by means of which the emphasis can be justified. The whole system really depends on the instructor's wisdom to see, and his willingness to communicate, that which his students should know, learn, be able to do at the end of his efforts. Whether the learning is facilitated in the mind of the learner by repetitively strengthening associations, by his plotting a cognitive map, by fitting his experience into a strategic framework, or by arranging motivationally stimulating

[3] Bruce Monroe, "Effects of Instructional Objectives in a Junior College" (dissertation in progress, University of California, Los Angeles, School of Education, 1967).

[4] John Prihoda, "A Followup Study of Graduates of the UCLA Teacher Preparation Program" (dissertation in progress, UCLA School of Education, 1967).

learning environments, defined outcomes have a place. Probably the only currently tenable explanation of the way learning occurs among broad groups of people is through the use of some shifting combination of elements derived from all blocks of theory. The main beginning point is that *ends* of instruction must be clearly known or all attempts to explain, to predict, or to control learning will break down.

Learning is as yet a mysterious process. We know that people learn in different ways—different from one another, different according to the task at hand, and different from one given time or set of circumstances to another. This is one reason why the merits of one instructional method cannot be demonstrated to the exclusion of others. Another reason is that the students involved, with their different modes of approach and with their varied patterns of reactions, cancel each other out; i.e., instruction vital to one student's learning often has a differential impact on others. That is why a generation of research on instructional practice can even now say little more than "In College *A*, Instructor *B* taught Concept *C* to Student *D* using Method *E*." There are likely to be as many ways of teaching and learning as there are teachers and students in junior colleges.

Still, many principles which do affect learning and which can be demonstrated in laboratory situations (and which do have implications for teaching) are rarely put into deliberate practice in the schools. For example, we know that repeated opportunity to practice the behavior desired as a result of achieved learning leads to greater retention of that learning. Yet that concept is repeatedly violated by instructors who attempt to "cover content" regardless of whether learners are given opportunity to practice the desired end behavior. That phenomenon is manifest in the extreme in junior college courses in which the instructor lectures for eight weeks to passive groups of students and then asks each of them to write an essay in which the lecture material is summarized and integrated.

Many other factors affecting the learning process are known and violated. We know that the active response made by the learner enhances learning, yet instructional practices in the junior college typically consist of instructors talking at students who remain quiet. Lectures are too often given on modes of composing communications—in situations where students would learn more by actually writing. The extreme of this is the hour-long lecture not uncommonly delivered on the uses of the comma in writing.

We know all learners don't learn in the same way, and yet individualized instruction in the junior college is a rarity; in most cases all students are subjected to the same treatment, as if all could learn in the same fashion.

We know that immediate knowledge of results and positive reinforcement can enhance learning.[5] Yet prevalent practices prevent students from learning the value of their responses for periods of time ranging up to weeks.

We know that sequencing of tasks from simplest to most complex has value for most learners, yet the most complex tasks are often required again and

[5] W. J. McKeachie, "Research on Teaching at the College and University Level," in N. L. Gage, *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963), p. 1155.

again. For example, a student may be asked to synthesize entire blocks of "subject matter" without any opportunity to practice simple recall of data basic to that synthesis.

We know that learners must perceive a sense of purpose of the activities in which they are engaged, yet communication of objectives in the junior college is a rarity. Students enroll, engage in activities, and are expected to make appropriate responses without clear definition of the purpose of the endeavor or of the general directions in which the activities are designed to lead. Similarly, we know that not everyone can teach in the same way. Yet, many preparation programs prescribe and recommend particular practices of teaching.

All of these general principles of learning are more often abused than followed. The preparation program which would make professional instructors of its participants must go beyond simply exhorting them to act in accordance with principles of learning; it must insist that they actually practice the behaviors in their own work. Hence the internship program's emphasis on defined outcomes, communication of results, and revised practices on the basis of learning achieved. Perhaps in this fashion, the professional instructor can be encouraged to move away from the recurring, self-indulgent lecture-textbook mode of teaching.

Much must be done before the School of Education's internship program can prescribe individual paths for each of its students. It now attempts to move all of them to the acceptance of points mentioned as extant in the body of knowledge in the profession, but it cannot yet prescribe separate ways for them to proceed. This is why the concept which requires that each demonstrate learning achieved by his students exercises the influence it does. We don't know how to diagnose entering abilities and tendencies of students. Perhaps some who enter the program can perform simple recall tasks with facility but find complex behaviors beyond their scope. Perhaps some learn sequentially, in step-by-step fashion, and others learn by viewing "the whole picture." Perhaps some are visually referented reader-learners and others are audio learners who would do better in a lecture-tape mode of presentation. The practices employed in the program itself include small-group discussions, lectures, and, basically, appropriate practice—teachers in training actually performing the tasks which the program sees as being relevant to their positions. For that reason they structure their own objectives, test items, entire courses, single concept replicable media units, and other instructional forms.

DEFINED ROLES OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

In the broadest sense, the University is attempting, through the internship program, to help junior colleges define for themselves a rationale, an approach, a reason for being. The junior college is no longer an experiment. It is an established institution. There are now opportunities for postsecondary education within the reach of practically everyone in the country. Most states have comprehensive junior college systems and most communities are willing to support some form of higher education for their young people. Thus, the junior college has demonstrated that it is possible to provide opportunity and that such oppor-

tunity will be accepted—one and one-half million students currently enrolled in American junior colleges evidence that fact.

It is possible, however, that junior colleges have been, on occasion, oversold. There are currently reactions against automatic support based simply on the "providing of opportunity" for everyone in the community. Disillusionment may result from the implications associated with the claims of junior college leaders that two-year colleges are an antidote to youth with no jobs, with no opportunity to go to college, and with general inability to learn in secondary school. The junior college is not in all cases serving its "salvage function." Job training and retraining programs are inadequate. Dropout rates are currently higher than is desirable.

Several paths are open now that the junior colleges have become established institutions. Junior colleges may in the future become like comprehensive secondary schools which offer all programs to all people with attendance compulsory. They may split into separate institutions, with one set offering vocational-remedial programs and the other, lower-division university work. They may drift, letting the fortunes of financing and of ideas coming from the outside dictate their processes. In such instances, they would continue as consumers of knowledge, on the one hand, and as resistors of change, on the other. They may see themselves as providing an environment in which something of unknown effect takes place. In that case, they would continue to tinker with scheduling and class sizes and similar nuts and bolts for unknown ends using no controls—under the delusion that if they keep manipulating the environment, some day all will be well and their students will become scholars appreciative of their efforts. In such an event, junior colleges may continue to attempt to convince their communities that whatever changes they install represent *prima facie* evidence of improvement.

If such efforts of the University as those represented by the Junior College Teaching Internship Program prove effectual, however, junior colleges will increasingly take the lead in *instruction*. They will achieve their identity as unique institutions not because they modeled their processes on the university or on the secondary school, but because they became known as the "place where learning occurs." For this to happen, they must specify outcomes and requisite entry points, they must diagnose learners and prescribe different treatments.

This direction for the junior college is the one which the program described in this monograph is attempting to promulgate. Although most junior colleges do not currently arrange specifically to cause and to demonstrate learning, several recent phenomena portend changes in their practices. One of these is that the first revolution of American education, in which the junior college played a leading role, is almost over. In the twenty years since the President's Commission on Higher Education so recommended, the door to higher education has been swung open by community college systems in almost every state. Colleges with branch campuses in the inner cities and in the rural districts offer Saturday classes and evening programs. Open admission policies and programs for everyone insure that no member of the community need miss the chance to attend. Now that the junior college is of age, it must move into the next phase—that of

justifying its existence. For it is not enough to say, "We provided the opportunity—take it or leave it."

A second phenomenon is that, more than ever, learning is taking place through other means than just the public schools. American industry is spending hundreds of millions of dollars teaching all sorts of things to all sorts of people. It is using many different forms of replicable media and is experimenting with ends as well as means. Government agencies often construct training programs outside the existing schools. Mass media also are engaged in great educational efforts—deliberately, through advertising and program content, and inadvertently, through the effects of the media themselves. Although they did not set out to do so, they have "already transformed the learning process of the young, quite independently of home and school alike."[8]

The junior college has not yet realized the urgency of reaching accommodation with these forces. Too often curricula are planned and instructional processes are introduced without any attempts being made to determine whether or not anyone learned what was supposed to be taught. If learning—human change—is to be fostered in the schools, curriculum and instruction must have direction, purpose, and design. Junior colleges can no longer justify their endeavors merely in terms of providing opportunities for students to engage in activities for reasons unknown. Schools have always had general goals; those goals must now be better understood. The attitudes, values, and abilities so nicely delineated in college catalogues must be defined, translated, fostered, and assessed. And basic to the definition is a description of the behaviors to be exhibited by students who have completed the programs. Without such definitions as points of beginning, it is quite likely that the mainstream of learning in America will run out from under its traditional educational structures.

In school, many different things may be taught and learned in many different ways—the classroom with forty chairs facing a "teacher's" podium is not the only way. Despite its relative infancy, the junior college is too guilty in many instances of perpetuating archaic instructional forms. The university may aid in defining the changed role of the teacher under the impact of replicable media and "machine-based" instruction. Teachers must understand and be prepared to accept changing responsibilities if they are to be expected to take a lead in new instructional practice. Failure to so define their situation leads them to see threat, not benefit, in different forms of instruction, information transmission, and care of the young.

There are many possible roles for the teacher other than that of information dispenser; all of them need to be explored and communicated. Even if validated autoinstructional programs were available in all fields to teach all concepts to all students (an unlikely prospect in this generation), instructors would still be needed to diagnose students, to prescribe learning paths, and to evaluate outcomes. Rather than perceiving replicable media as a threat, the instructor should view them and other changing instructional modes as opportunities aiding his efforts to move into true professional status. Conceptually, the UCLA Junior

[8] Marshall McLuhan, *Understanding Media*, 2nd ed. (New York: New American Library Inc., 1966), p. 193.

College Teaching Internship Program is consistent with this dynamic view of teaching in the schools of the future.

Education is too important to be treated lightly. The junior college system can no longer indulge masses of teachers who do not know whether or not their students have learned under their direction, who are pleased to sort, screen, and judge their charges, and who are not appalled at their own failures. The system cannot abide administrators who will not provide resources to seek evidence of changes in their students. The UCLA program attempts to instill a feeling of commitment to student learning of predicted and predictable form. It endeavors to encourage junior colleges to build a floor under accomplishments of its students. It recognizes that many forces stand in its way—not the least of which is simple inertia—but it sees its direction.

APPENDIX

DEFINING GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The process of specifying goals and objectives may be applied to any teaching field, and objectives in any field may be classified in any of several ways. Objectives may specify performance on tests or they may call for behavioral change which can be observed by other means. They may be such that one lesson would usually suffice to bring learners to successful attainment or they may indicate abilities which cannot be mastered until a long period of instruction has taken place. Some objectives demand that the action specified be exhibited; others suggest voluntary performance. There are objectives which call for in-class action and those which specify out-of-school behavior. Certain elements are common to all objectives, however, regardless of the field of study in which they are employed or of the level of complexity of behavior which they suggest.

"The student will be able to communicate effectively in writing." That goal, or one smilar, stems from a commitment to general education and is broad enough to be found in most college statements of direction. It is also typically found in junior college English courses. But objectives must be built, for several needs are not served by the goal statement alone. Attempts, for example, to evaluate a teacher's success in effecting the designated ability in his students could not be undertaken on the basis of the goal as stated. Construction of curriculum might take any direction, for interpretations of effective communication vary widely. And instructional procedures could not be established with any assurance of direct relevance. The specification of objectives is prerequisite to all of those undertakings.

An objective must meet three criteria—(1) it must specify a student action or product of such action, (2) it must state the conditions under which the performance will occur, and (3) it must establish a minimum performance criterion, a standard. There are many forms of writing which could be interpreted as "effective communication." For instance, if the student produces a coherent composition, he is giving evidence of his ability to communicate effectively in writing. To meet the first criterion for the objective then, the teacher must specify the type and approximate length of the composition and certain other pertinent facts. For example:

> The student will write a descriptive essay of 500–1000 words on a topic to be assigned.

That is the task performance by means of which the student shows he can com-

municate. Several other student actions may be derived from the same goal, for example:

> The student will write a 300–500 word set of specifications for construction of a model airplane.
>
> The student will write a 75–125 word description of one of twenty plants which may be found on the campus.

In each of these examples the action to be taken by the student is specified. In each case, he is giving evidence that he can communicate effectively in writing and, in each case, the nature of the communication is specified in advance.

The second criterion is a statement of the conditions and circumstances of the action. Does the teacher want his students to gain the ability to write their papers in class in a specified period of time? Does he want them limited to the use of certain reference materials? Conditions may be stated thus:

> Essay will be written in two hours under examination conditions; dictionary may be used.
>
> Description will be written as an overnight assignment.
>
> Student will be allowed three days and all library resources to write the paper.
>
> Essay will be written in fifty minutes with no aids and no rewrites permitted.

He thus establishes the circumstances under which the action will take place.

With the task and the conditions set, only the standard remains to be specified. The teacher may allow a few errors:

> No gross grammatical errors (fragments, run-ons); not more than two errors in spelling and three in punctuation.

He may want the student to communicate effectively regardless of his grammar:

> Description will enable the instructor to identify each of the plants from a set of twenty pictures.

He may require that the essay be mechanically near perfect:

> No gross grammatical errors (fragments, run-ons); no errors in spelling or in punctuation.

Setting the criterion depends on many factors—importance of the task, previous abilities of the students, time available for instruction, and so on. The point is that some minimum standard must be included in each objective.

Put all together, here is an objective as it is stated in practice:

> In a two-hour examination, the student will write a 500–1000 word descriptive essay on a topic to be assigned. No gross grammatical errors and a maximum of two errors in spelling and three in punctuation will be allowed. Dictionary may be used.

Note that there remains little ambiguity as to the nature of the task by means of which the student demonstrates his ability to communicate. Here are others:

> Given three days and the resources of the library, the student will write a 300–500 word set of specifications for construction of a model airplane. Specifications will be such that any woodworking student would be able to build and fly the plane.

Given twenty pictures of plants, the student will write a 75–125 word description of one of them so that the instructor may identify the plant. Paper may include no gross grammatical or spelling errors. Dictionary will be allowed. Time: thirty minutes.

In all these tasks terminal to a particular instructional sequence, the student is acting under a definite set of conditions when he demonstrates his ability to communicate. The teacher is not speculating on whether or not or how well the student can do it. His abilities to organize his thoughts, to handle language, to use rules of grammar, to spell, and so forth, are demonstrated in the task he has performed.

INTERIM OBJECTIVES

After the terminal task has been specified, interim objectives must be built. What are the several abilities prerequisite to the student's writing a composition? Each of the many possibilities needs to be defined as a separate task. A set of interim tasks or objectives can be plotted so that the student is led to the desired end ability. As in the case of terminal objectives, each must meet three criteria—a task indicative of a gained ability must be specified, conditions under which the performance will occur must be noted, and a minimum achievement standard must be set.

Here are a few examples of objectives designed to demonstrate abilities prerequisite to the task of writing an essay:

1) The goal is that the student recognize appropriate titles:

Given a 500 word descriptive essay and eight titles, two of which may be considered appropriate to the essay, the student will select one of the two titles. Time allowed, eight minutes. No reference work permitted.

2) The student must recognize the flow of ideas:

Given six paragraphs, the student will order them in sequence appropriate to form a coherent composition. Time allowed, ten minutes. No reference work permitted.

3) Does the student understand paragraph structure?

Given a paragraph and six possible topic sentences, the student will select the sentence which best applies. Five minutes, no reference works.

A critical point in curriculum construction is that each of the prerequisite abilities be itself stated as a specific objective. Only in that manner can checks be applied to the system at every point and the entire sequence of relevant experiences be efficiently directed and appropriately evaluated.

Following are examples of goals and objectives in other areas. All demand written test performance.

From a course in Elementary Statistical Methods:

Goal: The student will understand the usage of some terms basic to the study of Statistics.

Objectives:

1) Given a list of ten terms, he will match nine of them with the correct definitions. Ten minutes; no references.

2) Given twenty different groups of data, he will note for each whether they are continuous or discrete. Ten minutes; no references; 80 per cent criterion.

3) Given twenty different numbers he will write for each the number of significant figures in it. Seven minutes; no references; 90 per cent criterion.

From a course in Biology:

Goal: The student will understand fundamentals of respiration.

Objectives:

1) Given the respiratory rate for a certain animal under given conditions, he will write the temperature under which that rate is most likely to occur. No refernces; criterion ± .3°.

2) Given a list of plant parts, he will select the part where photosynthesis occurs at the greatest rate. Two minutes; no references.

3) Given a list of chemical compounds, he will select one that is found at each step in the process of respiration and one that is found at each step in the process of photosynthesis. Five minutes; no references; 80 per cent criterion.

From a course in Materials of Engineering:

Goal: The student will know certain properties of ferrous metals.

Objectives:

1) He will list eight (of the 16) microstructural constituents of ferrous metals. No references; ten minutes.

2) Given a list of five microstructural constituents of ferrous metals, he will write a ten to fifty word description of each of those constituents to be found in a given annealed steel. Fifteen minutes; no references.

Objectives may demand manipulative as well as cognitive skills.

From a course in Architectural Rendering:

Goal: The student will be able to use materials basic to mylar film rendering.

Objectives:

1) On vellum paper, he will use 1/16" zip-a-line tape to delineate the walls of a given house plan. No gross errors in size of dwelling and no errors in intersections of walls and corners permitted.

2) Using press-on letters, he will label each area of a given dwelling. No errors in spelling or in application of letters permitted.

Objectives may also specify long-range attitudinal change.

From a Political Science course:

Goal: Students will be stimulated to take an active part in political processes.

Objectives:

1) Within six months after the end of the course, 90 per cent of the eligible students will have registered to vote.

2) In the next general election, 80 percent of the eligible students will vote.

3) In the next election campaign, 25 per cent of the students will participate by distributing handbills, making calls, or working in a candidate's office for a period of not less than forty hours.

4) Within five years, at least one student will himself campaign for a public office.

From a course in Literature:

Goal: The student will gain an appreciation for twentieth-century American literature.

Objectives:

1) Although poetry is not "covered" in the course, 75 per cent of the students shall voluntarily read at least five poems by contemporary American poets before the end of the term.

2) Fifty per cent of the students shall elect to take a second course in American literature within one year after completing this course.

3) The students shall voluntarily read an average of four contemporary American novels per year over the next four-year period.

In these last two sets of objectives, it will be noted that the instructor is making predictions as to the number or per cent of students who will perform the specified action.

One of the more successful attempts to classify objectives is represented by the *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives,* Volumes I and II.[1] The *Taxonomy* divides behaviors into "Cognitive" and "Affective" Domains and subdivides the Domains by levels of complexity. Following are examples of objectives built at each level of the Cognitive Domain for a course in Calculus. These objectives would all be tested under usual closed-book examination conditions. The concept to be taught is the Calculus concept of the Derivative.

LEVEL I: KNOWLEDGE OR RECALL

Goal: The learner will be able to recall and recognize definitions and formulas concerning derivatives.

Objective: When given 14 definitions concerned with the concept of derivatives (derivative, tangent line, differentiation, relative maximum, etc.) and the 14 formulas covered under this concept (power formula, sum formula chain rule, etc.), the learner will define 12 of the 14 definitions in as few words as possible and will be able to match the 14 formulas with their names with 100 per cent accuracy.

LEVEL II: COMPREHENSION

Goal: The learner will develop the ability to comprehend and interpret given conclusions and prepare graphic representations of recorded equations.

Objectives:

1) The learner will prove three out of four exercises, involving the continuity of a differential function, correctly in as short a method as he is able.

2) Given a set of exercises involving the power function and the sum formula, the learner will take these exercises and their given answers and show how this answer was obtained, with 80 per cent accuracy.

3) Given a set of functions, the learner will show that the graph of each of the

[1] Bloom, 1956; Krathwohl, 1964.

functions has a vertical tangent line at the indicated point, with 80 per cent accuracy.

LEVEL III: APPLICATION

Goal: The learner will be able to apply principles, formulas, or theorems to new situations.

Objectives:

1) The learner will solve given problems involving derivatives, differentiation, increasing and decreasing functions, and extrema, with 75 per cent accuracy on each problem.

2) When given a set of 10 functions, the learner will graph 8 of these correctly.

LEVEL IV: ANALYSIS

Goal: The learner will be able to analyze material so as to separate fact from hypothesis and detect logical conclusions.

Objective: Given theorems involving continuity, increasing and decreasing functions, and extrema, and proofs resulting from these theorems, the learner will:
a. distinguish the facts from the hypothesis
b. draw conclusions from supporting statements
c. pick assumptions which justify given conclusions with 75 per cent accuracy on each item.

LEVEL V: SYNTHESIS

Goal: The learner will develop the ability to synthesize knowledge of theorems and apply this knowledge by the development of proofs.

Objective: Given four theorems that he, as a learner, has never seen, he will formulate a proof for each of these theorems by drawing on elements from previous sources and relating them together to form a pattern proof. This will be done with 80 per cent accuracy.

LEVEL VI: EVALUATION

Goal: The learner will be able to make judgments about the value of given material as well as his own choices of conclusions in relation to theorems and proofs.

Objective: Given theorems and proofs, the learner will:
a. explain in writing his judgment of the validity of the proof and support this judgment.
b. defend or attack, in writing, the given proof.
c. determine the logical conclusion from a choice of conclusions and judge the accuracy of the given statements which led him to pick his conclusion.
All of the above are to be done with 75 per cent accuracy.

A junior college course built on the defined-outcomes rationale will usually contain between thirty and one hundred specific objectives arranged sequentially within course units. A statement such as "Unless otherwise stated, all assessments will take place under usual examination conditions" is often used to head a list of objectives. Sample test items are written and included along with each objective which specifies examination performance.

Precise specification of objectives is a device which can enhance communication between instructor and student, between instructor and colleagues, and, most important, between instructor and himself regarding purposes of a unit, a course, or a curriculum.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Master Plan for Higher Education in California. 1960–1975. Sacramento, California: State Department of Education, 1960.

American Association of Junior Colleges. "A Supplementary Statement on the 'Education Professions Development' Program (April 19, 1967)." (Mimeo.)

BARR, A. S., and JONES, R. E. "The Measurement and Prediction of Teacher Efficiency." *Review of Educational Research,* XXVIII, 3 (June 1958).

BLOCKER, CLYDE E. "Are Our Faculties Competent?" *Junior College Journal,* XXXVI, 4 (December 1965).

———. *The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.

BLOOM, BENJAMIN S. (ed.). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives I: Cognitive Domain.* New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1956.

BRAWER, FLORENCE B., and COHEN, ARTHUR M. "Global and Sign Approaches to Rorschach Assessment of Beginning Teachers." *Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment,* XXX, 6 (1966).

California Education Code, Article 1.5 of Chapter 2 of Division 10.

COFFMAN, W. E. "Determining Students' Concepts of Effective Teaching from Their Ratings of Instructors." *Journal of Educational Psychology,* XLV, 19 (May, 1954).

COHEN, ARTHUR M. "Teach toward Measurable Objectives." *Improving College and University Teaching,* XIV, 4 (Autumn 1966).

COHEN, A. M., and BRAWER, F. B. "Adaptive Potential and First-Year Teaching Success." *Journal of Teacher Education,* XVIII, 2 (Summer 1967).

COLVERT, C. C., and BAKER, M. L. *The Status of College and University Offerings and Services in the Area of Junior College Education and Professional Upgrading of Junior College Faculty Members.* Austin, Tex.: Research Office, American Association of Junior Colleges, 1955.

COOPER, RUSSELL M. "The College Teaching Crisis." *Journal of Higher Education,* XXXV (January 1964).

DIEKHOFF, JOHN S. *A Report of the College Faculty Internship Program.* New York: Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1961.

DIXON, W. R., and MORSE, W. C. "The Prediction of Teaching Performance: Empathic Potential." *Journal of Teacher Education,* XII, 3 (September 1961).

GAGE, N. L. (ed.). "Paradigms for Research on Teaching." *Handbook of Research on Teaching.* Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1963.

GAGNE', ROBERT M. *The Conditions of Learning.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1965.

GARRISON, ROGER. *Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.

GETZELS, J. W., and JACKSON, P. W. "The Teacher's Personality and Characteristics." In Gage, N. L. *Handbook of Research.* Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1964.

GLEAZER, EDMUND J., Jr. "Preparation of Junior College Teachers." *Educational Record,* XLVIII (Spring 1967).

GUSTAD, JOHN W. "On Improving College Teaching." *NEA Journal,* LIII (March 1964).

HENDERSON, LEON N. "An Internship in Junior College Teaching." *Junior College Journal,* XXVIII, 7 (March 1957).

HILGARD, ERNEST R. *Theories of Learning.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1956.
HOYT, D. P. "The Relationship between College Grades and Adult Achievement. A Review of the Literature." Research Reports. No. 7. Iowa City, Ia.: American College Testing Program (September 1965).
JOHNSON, B. LAMAR. *New Directions for Instruction in the Junior College.* Los Angeles: University of California, School of Education, Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report Number 7 (March 1965).
KOOS, LEONARD V. "Preparation for Community College Teaching." *Journal of Higher Education,* XXI (June 1950).
———. "Programs of Junior College Teacher Preparation." *Junior College Journal,* XIX, 6 (February 1949).
KRATHWOHL, DAVID R., and others (eds.). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives II: Affective Domain.* New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1964.
LEAVITT, J. E. "Personnel Data and Prediction of Success in Student Teachers." *The Journal of Teacher Education,* IV (September 1953).
LOOMIS, WILLIAM G. "A Study of the Formal Preparation of Academic Teachers in Community Colleges with Proposals for Oregon." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Oregon State University, 1965.
MAGER, ROBERT F. *Preparing Instructional Objectives.* Palo Alto, Calif.: Fearon Press, 1962.
MAYHEW, LEWIS B. *The Professional Needs of College Teachers.* Stanford University: June 10, 1964. (Mimeo.)
MCKEACHIE, W. J. "Research on Teaching at the College and University Level." In Cage, N. L. *Handbook of Research on Teaching.* Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.
MCLUHAN, MARSHALL. *Understanding Media.* 2nd ed. New York: New American Library Inc., 1966.
MEDSKER, LELAND. *The Junior College: Progress and Prospect.* New York: McGraw Hill, 1960.
MIKALSON, ROY G. "The Impact of 1961 Legislation Relating to Probationary Teachers on Instruction and Administrative Practices in California Public Junior Colleges." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1964.
MILLER, RALPH. "A Descriptive Survey of Some Internship Programs." University of California, Los Angeles, School of Education, 1963. (Mimeo.)
MONROE, BRUCE. "Effects of Instructional Objectives in a Junior College." Dissertation in progress, University of California, Los Angeles, School of Education, 1967.
ORT, V. K. "A Study of Some Techniques Used for Predicting the Success of Teachers." *The Journal of Teacher Education,* XV (March 1964).
PRIHODA, JOHN J. "A Followup Study of Graduates of the University of California, Los Angeles, Junior College Teacher Education Programs." Dissertation in progress, University of California, Los Angeles, School of Education, 1967.
RYANS, D. G. *Characteristics of Teachers.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960.
SPRINTHALL, N. A., WHITELY, J. M., and MOSHER, R. L. "A Study of Teacher Effectiveness." *The Journal of Teacher Education,* XVII, 1 (Spring 1966).
STERN, G. G., STEIN, M. J., and BLOOM, B. S. *Methods in Personality Assessment,* rev. ed. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1963.
"Summary of Replies to Questionnaire on Criteria for Employment of Junior College Teachers." Rio Hondo Junior College, May 13, 1966. (Mimeo.)
"The Re-Organization of Teacher Education at UCLA." University of California, Los Angeles, School of Education, June 23, 1961. (Mimeo.)
THORNTON, JAMES W. *The Community Junior College.* 2nd ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966.
TILLERY, DALE H. "Academic Rank: Promise or Peril?" *Junior College Journal,* XXXIII, 6 (February 1963).
WOODRING, PAUL. *New Directions in Teacher Education.* New York: The Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1957.

3m-3,'68(H7798)

concept. In addition, it is designed to attract persons to teaching who might otherwise not enter the profession. It consists of four phases through which the intern progresses: recruitment and selection, placement, preinternship training, and internship teaching.

RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION

A School of Education faculty member with particular interest in junior college teacher preparation serves as internship program director. Under his guidance, candidates for internships are recruited. He transmits publicity about the program to local newspapers and to UCLA department chairmen, as well as to other graduate school campuses in the area. Posters (see example on next page) and brochures describing the program are placed in likely spots around the University. Modest costs for printing and mailing are borne by the School of Education. The program director and other faculty and staff members describe the program at junior college meetings and answer mail and telephone inquiries from prospective candidates. Much support for recruitment is gained from junior college deans and presidents who often send inexperienced candidates for positions in their institutions to the program for training.

Selection of candidates usually occurs during the winter preceding the intern year. It is not a rigorous process—basically, the candidate need but be in possession of a master's degree in a subject normally taught in the junior college and be admissable to UCLA Graduate Division and to the School of Education. Candidates with prior experience (other than as teaching assistants or as occasional substitutes) may not apply for internships because of the program's policy to serve as an initial point of entry into the teaching profession.

Following is a detailed breakdown of selection requirements as listed in a brochure prepared by the Teacher Education Project.

To be selected, an individual must have:

1. A master's degree, doctor's degree, or other postgraduate degree (such as Bachelor of Laws), or the equivalent, requiring not less than five years of college or university education. The most recent year of full-time study, or the last earned degree, must have been at UCLA or an approved institution recognized by the admissions office of UCLA.

2. Forty-five semester hours of course work must be taken at UCLA or an approved institution recognized by the admissions office of UCLA in four of the six areas listed below. Not more than six of these semester hours shall apply toward the major or minor. These areas may be completed by examination, taken either at UCLA or an approved institution recognized by the admissions office of UCLA, but such an examination shall not reduce the total number of units required in this provision. The areas are:

   a. Humanities, excluding foreign languages for the purposes of this requirement, but including a year of English and a course in English composition, or certifica- of competency by an institutional examination.
   b. Social Sciences.
   c. Natural Sciences.
   d. Mathematics requiring high school algebra and geometry, or the equivalent, as prerequisite.
   e. Fine Arts.
   f. Foreign Languages.

TEACH
IN A JUNIOR
COLLEGE

If you will:

Have a Master's Degree in a subject-matter field by June

Spend one quarter in a training program at UCLA

You may be eligible to secure a teaching position in a junior college in Southern California through the

UCLA Teaching Internship Program

INQUIRE:

Junior College Teaching Internship Program
Office of Student Services
Moore Hall 201
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

UCLA Publications Service

3. A major and a minor (as defined by the Rules and Regulations of the State Board of Education implementing the Licensing of Certified Personnel Law of 1961) in a subject normally taught in the junior college.

4. An undergraduate upper division overall grade-point average of 3.0 or higher; a grade-point average of 2.75 or higher in all courses comprising the major and minor; a grade-point average of 3.0 or higher in all graduate work (A = 4.0).

5. The tests required for admission to the School of Education at the graduate level—(1) the Graduate Record Examination or the Miller Analogies and the Doppelt Mathematics Test, (2) specialized tests in the candidate's teaching field (e.g., Graduate Record Examination Advanced Tests), if such tests exist, and (3) appropriate personality inventories.

6. Satisfactory ratings in group and individual interviews conducted by student-personnel specialists, subject-matter specialists, and other staff members in the junior college area.

7. Effective oral and written skills of communication, including English grammar and composition.

8. Good physical and mental health.

9. United States citizenship and completion of the California state requirement for a course in American History and Institutions.

10. Satisfactory letters of recommendation from those such as employers, teachers, etc., who are well acquainted with the scholarly, professional, and personal qualifications of the applicant.

Processing of applications is done by the School of Education's Office of Student Services. Counselors advise prospective candidates and help them complete necessary forms. The application packet must include a personal data form, three letters of recommendation, and transcripts of all college work. The forms, when complete, are sent to the Educational Placement Office.

PLACEMENT

Placement of interns in area junior colleges is undertaken by the Educational Placement Office in a manner similar to that which it applies to regular candidates for teaching positions. Candidates are interviewed by a placement officer, who attempts to determine junior colleges for which the intern would be suited. Criteria include size, location, salary paid, and types of programs offered. The placement officer then assists the candidate in applying to particular junior colleges and in arranging for interviews in which the employing administrator meets with the candidates. These interviews may take place at the junior college or at UCLA. Candidates may apply for either full-time or part-time positions with commensurate pay.

The final determination of placement remains with the junior college to which the intern applies for a position. Since interns are paid at the same rate, and work under the same conditions as other beginning teachers, they must compete with other candidates for openings. In some fields, junior colleges in Southern California interview as many as ten or fifteen candidates for the same position. The prospective intern must convince the employing administrator that he is best qualified. The fact that he has the support of the internship

program is often a help; the inexperienced teacher may otherwise be at a severe disadvantage in securing a full-time position.

Applications for the program are accepted in winter and spring. Most employment contracts are negotiated between March and June of the year in which the intern is to begin teaching. If he is accepted for a position, the intern enrolls in the UCLA spring quarter or summer session for his preinternship course work. No intern is allowed to assume responsibilities in the junior college until he has gone through "The Junior College Curriculum" course, a course designed especially for the internship program.

During the fall, the intern teaches in the junior college. He is under the general supervision of the program, but in the junior college he is treated as any other first-time teacher. He attends bi-weekly seminars on the UCLA campus and submits certain materials to the program director on a regular basis. Otherwise, he is on his own.

CHAPTER III

RATIONALE AND PRACTICE

The mechanics of the UCLA Junior College Teaching Internship Program have been described in terms of the recruitment, selection, and placement of candidates. These procedures are more or less standard in internship programs designed to prepare teachers for service at various levels of education.[1] However, since the junior college is a force which "places great stress on excellent teaching,"[2] specific preparation for teaching in that institution is of particular importance. The UCLA program has the additional distinction of being founded upon a definitive rationale and a deliberate view of teaching. It seeks to influence junior college teaching in distinct ways and to make an impact on the profession beyond training people for service. The rationale—the focus for the program—is, simply stated: *Teaching is causing learning.* The program's entire thrust, which will be described in this chapter, is based upon that definition.

There is currently in American education a marked gap between the preparation sequences experienced by elementary and secondary school teachers, on the one hand, and by senior college teachers, on the other. Certification requirements for the former group demand immersion in several courses dealing with pedagogical theory and practice. For the latter, there is no credential required other than the possession of a graduate degree in an academic discipline. There cannot be so much difference in teaching at the various levels of education that the one calls for a year or more of deliberate training to teach and the other calls for none. The difficulty experienced by students moving from high school to college may be in part a result of the fact that teachers at the two levels of education are selected differently, think of themselves as members of different professions, are trained differently, and communicate little with each other.[3] One preparation sequence or the other is out of phase.

The junior college teacher stands between. Desperately trying to be identified with "higher" education, his institution demands little in the nature of deliberate training sequences. Several recent developments indicate that he, too, prefers to see himself as a "college professor." The spread of university-type academic senates points to the junior college instructor's increasing voice in institutional operations. Research, too, is becoming a more prominent factor in his life; although he is not required to conduct research and to publish on his

[1] Ralph Miller, "A Descriptive Survey of Some Internship Programs" (Los Angeles: University of California, School of Education, mimeo., 1963).

[2] James W. Thornton, *The Community Junior College*, 2nd ed. (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966), p. 48.

[3] Paul Woodring, *New Directions in Teacher Education* (New York: The Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1957), p. 79.

own, more and more the junior college teacher is expected to participate in institutional studies. Faculty ranking systems patterned on those of the university are more widespread than they were only a few years ago.[4] In addition, credential requirements in some states have been severely reduced or completely eliminated. In California, for example, to obtain a life junior college teaching credential, one need but present evidence of a master's degree in an academic subject area. These and other changes strengthen the image of the instructor as a "college professor" rather than a "school teacher."

While this may be desirable from many standpoints, the junior college instructor's self-identification with the university professor can also produce negative side effects. His own view is often that of the professor as lecturer, standing before his students and spinning a web of words in and around his chosen area. Such a view may lead him to a recurring pattern of lecture-textbook "teaching" which can be, at best, an inspiration for students to learn on their own but, more often, may be viewed by them as a stultifying spray of words. In these cases, student failure may indicate the victim's inability to live up to the standards of self-direction, which the instructor imagines to be "college level."[5]

But even when the effect of "university identity" is more positively related to student success, and no matter how the trappings of the university may appear in the status and functioning of the junior college instructor, the nature of his responsibility is different for several reasons. All of these relate to the commitment of the two-year college to teaching. The defined tasks of the university faculty member include teaching, but that act is essentially subordinate to several of his other functions;[6] the main purpose of the junior college instructor, on the other hand, is to teach. The university professor labors within a narrow disciplinary range, a defined segment of an area of knowledge. The junior college teacher, however, must be committed to both a broad field of teaching and a specialization in instructional processes. In the university, research is for the purpose of finding new knowledge; junior college research, whether conducted by instructors or by other directors, is usually geared toward seeking better ways to help students learn.[7] The junior college is, first and last, a teaching institution. Accordingly, it is essential that junior college teacher preparation be recognized as a deservedly distinct enterprise. Neither the year of "education" course work and apprenticeship of the school teacher nor the "nontraining" of the college professor will suffice.

LIMITATIONS ON PROGRAM DESIGN

Even though junior college teacher training must be deliberately undertaken, several factors militate against a specific preparation sequence—one that would fit all potential instructors in all fields in all junior colleges. Among these

[4] Dale R. Tillery, "Academic Rank: Promise or Peril?" *Junior College Journal*, XXXIII, 6 (Feb. 1963), 6-8.

[5] B. Lamar Johnson, *New Directions for Instruction in the Junior College* (Los Angeles: University of California, School of Education, Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report Number 7, March 1962).

[6] Clyde E. Blocker, *The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), p. 144.

[7] *A Master Plan for Higher Education in California, 1960-1975* (Sacramento, Calif.: State Department of Education, 1960), p. 116.

limitations are the diverse goals of junior colleges generally, peculiarities among institutions, and the variety of people who would enter a preparation program.

Preparing a person to become a teacher is a multifaceted task. Perhaps it has its earliest roots in the home situation, where the child's relationships with his earliest teachers, his parents, represent his first exposure to a teaching-learning situation. From there, the embryonic teacher picks up experience from other sources—early faculty, school environmental impressions, the general setting of the maturing child. The personality traits which define the teacher's life are very likely firmly embedded in him long before he decides to enter the profession.[8] When finally a potential teacher goes to the college or university to "learn" the ways of "teaching," he already has an armament of impressions and a mass of apperceptions. Several teachers-to-be in the same classroom with the same professor, similar in all measurable respects (age, sex, previous academic achievement, etc.) will still learn in different ways and will still communicate different impressions to others. Teachers are people—variable, unique, and dependent upon past experiences as well as contemporary exposure.

Another problem is that junior college goals are both broad and narrow. Many forces in the college attempt to affect students' lives through general education. The intent is to lead students to gain attitudes and abilities requisite to their becoming self-fulfilling, effective citizens of the world. Yet, goals may be as narow as requiring that the student learn a particular task in a specific work situation. Such restrictive aims are typically found in specialized occupational programs. Diversity of institutional functions and goals, then, represent another consideration in teacher preparation.

Differences among people and purposes are accentuated by at least one more dimension—peculiarities among junior colleges. Although superficially similar, teaching conditions among schools even in the same geographical area are often markedly different. Many of these emerge from the fact that the two-year college as a community college attempts to adapt its programs and processes to the needs of people in the locale in which it is situated. Moreover, criteria for the "effective teacher" have never been stabilized. Some junior colleges demand that teachers continue to be professionally involved in their academic disciplines —that they frequently take courses or attend meetings and seminars. Others stress committee service and reward instructors who participate in school and community activities. In many schools, teachers are expected to participate in student guidance, whereas in others that function is not emphasized as part of their charge. All variations in the field point to the difficulty in designing a teacher preparation program which might meet all possible requirements.

A set, specific program to do everything is, then, unlikely. There is no one "right way" to prepare teachers any more than there is one "right way" to teach. Instead of attempting to formulate a single program which would bring all people to the ability to perform all possible tasks in all institutions, it was necessary for the UCLA Teacher Education Project to develop a rationale for teacher preparation which would be applicable to a wide variety of types of people and

[8] Lewis B. Mayhew, "The Professional Needs of College Teachers" (Palo Alto, Calif.: Stanford University, mimeo., June 10, 1964), p. 3.

institutions. This had to be a rationale by means of which definite guidelines could be stablished, a rationale so consistent that any kind of person who wished to join the ranks of junior college instructors in any institution might be appropriately guided.

RATIONALE

How formulate a rationale for a teacher preparation program that will answer all those needs? How develop an operational philosophy which will serve the many different prospective teachers in their varied academic and technical fields? Where, indeed, find defensible reasons for offering junior college teacher preparation beyond the facts that those institutes represent a unique segment of education and present varying demands.

The various functions and goals of junior colleges are, in actuality, inseparable from teaching, from the instructional process itself. Instruction is the single purpuse which, more than any other, guides two-year colleges. Junior college involvement in, and commitment to, teaching and learning overrides all supplementary goals and functions, broad and narrow.[9] Whatever else the instructor is expected to do, whoever he may be, he must, above all, teach. If a rationale for guiding the program of junior college teacher preparation is to be developed, it must be founded upon the process of instruction, the one concern which affects all teachers, all administrators and all students in every junior college.

The first step in developing a rationale is definition of terms. What is teaching? It is certainly the most important aspect of the teacher's many duties, but what is it conceptually?

Teaching has been characterized in many ways—all concerned, actually or by extension, with affecting people. Gustad calls it "creat[ing] a situation in which maximum learning can and will take place."[10] Gage describes it as "any interpersonal influence aimed at changing the ways in which other persons can or will behave."[11] These and other definitions which might be cited can be brought together in one simple statement: "Teaching is causing learning." The word "causing" may here be modified—"allowing," "stimulating," "facilitating," even "getting-out-of-the-way-of" will do—but there can be no operationally satisfactory definition of teaching which fails to include the term "learning."

Learning is, then, by definition, a necessary condition of teaching—no learning means that no teaching has taken place. But what is learning? Again, the literature in the field points the way. Hilgard suggests that learning is "the process by which an activity originates or is changed through reacting to an encountered situation . . ."[12] Gagne' identifies it as "a change in human disposition or capability which can be retained . . ."[13] Both definitions characterize learning as human change, one adding the condition of retention. Gagne' modifies his definition further by saying, "It exhibits itself as a change in behavior

---

[9] Thornton, p. 41.
[10] John W. Gustad, "On Improving College Teaching," *NEA Journal*, LIII (Mar. 1964), 37–38.
[11] N. L. Gage (ed.), "Paradigms for Research on Teaching," *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1963), p. 96.
[12] Ernest R. Hilgard, *Theories of Learning* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1956), p. 2.
[13] Robert M. Gagne', *The Conditions of Learning* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965), p. 5.

and the inference of learning is made by comparing what behavior was possible before and what after treatment."[4]

Learning may thus be characterized as a changed capability for, or tendency toward, acting in particular ways. It is retainable and not ascribable merely to normal growth, maturation, or to temporary states caused by drugs or fatigue. We don't know *how* it occurs—exactly what happens in the mind to allow change is still a challenging but undetermined question—but we do know *that* it occurs.

Inferences of learning are made by observing changes in learner actions or the products of such actions. In teaching situations, by gathering evidence of the different forms of response available to learners after instruction, of the altered manner in which they conduct their activities, we infer that learning has taken place. Unknown though the process itself may be, when we observe people doing something they could not do previously, we say that they have learned.

As learning can be inferred by observing changed learner actions or products of actions, teaching can be inferred by determining what learning has occurred as a result of certain exposures. And though learning may occur without teaching, teaching cannot take place without learning. This is the central point—if no evidence of learning can be produced, no inference of teaching can be made.

The UCLA Junior College Teaching Internship Program was organized on that definitive rationale. Its directors recognized that instructional processes prevalent in California community colleges were, for the most part, *not* based on the teaching-learning paradigm. They determined that it was not the function of the UCLA program to prepare instructors who would accept current methods unquestioningly and who would adopt preexisting mores uncritically. Rather, the UCLA School of Education attempted to construct a program from which instructional leaders would come. These teachers would arrange their professional practices so that they could predict, gather, and submit evidence of learning achieved by their students. They would thus advance the stature of their junior colleges as "teaching" institutions—institutions designed to cause learning.

The UCLA program avoided any consideration of teaching which would characterize it merely as lecturing, preparing exams, interacting with students, or performing similar activities in which teachers commonly engage. Such skills are certainly valuable for teachers to hold, but teacher activities must be recognized for what they are—they are the media by means of which instruction is most often conducted. They are not, in actuality, "teaching." Teaching occurs only to the extent that learning takes place. Failure to accept that premise often leads teacher preparation to focus on matters peripheral to teaching or on indefensible drill in "methods."

Similarly, learning must not be considered reading, listening, studying, and other activities in which students typically engage. These are necessary, of course, as input or stimuli for the learner but the activities are not themselves "learning." Actual learning can only be inferred by attending to the activities, behaviors, or products of action of the learner after he has taken part in the situ-

[4] Ibid.

ations arranged for him by the instructor. In this context, reading, listening, studying are the media of learning. As such, they stimulate the process of mind by means of which learning (changed capability) occurs. No other significance should be attached to the students' activities.

The UCLA program was designed to produce learning specialists to staff California junior colleges. The core of the program became the requirement that prospective instructors *teach; ergo,* that their students *learn* under their direction. They were to be evaluated on the basis of learning achieved by their students. *All facets of the program were designed to bring interns to the ability to specify objectives, select appropriate media, and gather evidence of learning.* Other aspects of the teacher's position were viewed as peripheral to his main task and were relegated to a secondary position in the preparation sequence. The entire program was pointed toward moving the interns to a position from which they could manage student learning in the most precise sense. Matters parochial to the institutions in which they would labor—committee service, text selection procedures, report filing, faculty organizations, etc.—were left to the junior colleges themselves.

CHAPTER IV

THE CORE COURSE

The teaching-learning paradigm was thus accepted as the basic thrust of UCLA's teaching internship program. Teachers were to be prepared who would hold certain skills and attitudes. Each would gain the ability to act as a learning specialist. Each would be led to hold as a value-set the statement, "My purpose is to do all I can to cause students to learn." To accomplish that purpose, a core course, *The Junior College Curriculum*, was developed and a pattern of seminars and meetings was introduced.

Currently, each intern enrolls in *The Junior College Curriculum* course in the summer before he assumes teaching responsibilities in a junior college. After he has begun teaching, in order to demonstrate his skill in managing learning, he participates in alternate Saturday seminars at UCLA during the first semester of his intern year. To enlarge his teaching frame of reference he attends different types of meetings—group sessions with other teachers and administrators, for example—in his second semester as a teacher. This pattern is designed to first move him into the specific requisite abilities and then to the broad generalities associated with his position.

At the beginning of the first semester for which he is employed, the intern assumes full responsibilities as a faculty member at the junior college. Practice teaching done concurrently with the preservice course is optional; interns who so desire are put in contact with regular junior college faculty members, who allow them to conduct a few lectures or discussion sessions. Thus some of the interns may have served previously as unofficial "practice teachers" in junior colleges near UCLA, but for most, their own classes are the first they face. As part of their preinternship training, many interns, especially those for whom the whole junior college concept is new, enroll at UCLA in a separate course designed to teach the history, structure, and organization of the junior college. But for all, the beginning of the academic year finds them on their own in their classrooms.

The basic course in the program is *The Junior College Curriculum*, offered in the graduate division. As their major projects, the students construct outlines for the specific junior college teaching which they plan to do. These outlines are *not* "lesson plans"; they are complete listings of the way actual learning takes place and will be demonstrated by junior college students whom the interns will teach. Each includes its own valid reasons why that course is offered in the junior college, a statement of the nature and types of junior college students who are likely to enroll in it, copies of examinations or other assessment devices which the intern anticipates using, and plans for course evaluation and revision.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

As the heart of each of his courses, the intern lays out goals and objectives toward which his students will be led. Each of these terms—goal and objective—is used quite deliberately; each is precisely defined and followed.

The term "goal" indicates the broad range of abilities which students will gain by attending the interns' courses; it implies a process of mind. Typical goals, for example, are: (1) students will be able to communicate effectively; (2) students will understand scientific methodology; (3) students will learn to think critically; (4) students will appreciate American democratic processes; and so on. It must be recognized that educational goals indicate actions to be taken, skills to be learned, abilities to be gained, attitudes to be held or modified by the students as a result of their having attended the institution.

The term "objective," as used in the UCLA program, indicates a specific, observable student action or product of student action. To satisfy this definition, an objective must: first, specify something the student is to do; second, state the circumstances under which he will do it; and, third, note the degree of accuracy with which he will perform the action.[1]

Both goals and objectives indicate something which is to happen to the student—in the one case, attitudes or abilities to be gained; in the other specific actions or definite products of student actions. Under no circumstances do we consider "goal" or "objective" to be that which is to be provided by the college or the instructors. To say, in this context, that a college goal is "to provide opportunity for students to fulfill themselves" or that an objective is "to offer courses which meet university requirements" is inappropriate. Nor is "The instructor will . . ." an objective; it always and only represents that which is to be learned by students.

The teaching interns are also led to understand that goals and objectives are not to be confused with means. These terms are not methods or activities but are themselves the *ends*, the outcomes of instruction. Within each objective are the seeds of assessment devices and instructional procedures—indeed, complete sets of objectives lend direction to all processes within the framework of the junior college curriculum. But the objectives themselves are distinct statements, each of which must meet the designated criteria.

Because the setting of goals and objectives is essential to teaching and to the internship program, sources of junior college goals are examined and goal-setting is stressed in the course. Interns learn that junior college goals are drawn from sources both extra- and intrainstitutional.[2] Whether programs are titled liberal or general education, vocational preparation or community service, goals are influenced by policies of governing boards, social pressures, types of students, administrative orientation, and a host of other factors. Interns create goals which fit the purposes of specific colleges and which may be found within the framework of their own subject areas. They then refine the goals into specific measurable objectives. (The process is more fully explained in the Appendix.)

[1] Arthur M. Cohen, "Teach Toward Measurable Objectives," *Improving College and University Teaching*, XIV, 4 (Autumn 1966), 246–248. See also Robert F. Mager, *Preparing Instructional Objectives* (Palo Alto, Calif.: Fearon Press, 1962).

[2] Clyde E. Blocker and others, *The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965).

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE CURRICULUM COURSE

The Junior College Curriculum serves as both course and model. Its units are designed to lead interns, step by step, to the construction of courses they will teach in their own subject fields during their intern year. The course is varied somewhat from year to year. A list of the units currently in use follows, along with explanations of why each unit is included and statements of unit goals.

Unit I: The Junior College: Functions, Facilities, Students

The junior college is a historically recent phenomenon. Its goals are drawn both from current society and from the needs of individual students. It is a pragmatic, flexible, dynamic institution. The facilities and services of junior colleges extend far beyond the individual classrooms. The instructor should be aware of the variety of services available to his students and of the many facets of the college which can aid in the process of curriculum. He should also consider the types of students who attend junior colleges, for their ages, abilities, and goals vary widely. Understanding the nature and purpose of the institution is prerequisite to the formulation of courses and programs.

Unit I Goals: The student will understand the functions of junior colleges and the derivation of their goals. He will be able to apply these criteria to junior college practices. He will also understand the extent of facilities and services available in junior colleges and the numbers and types of students who enroll in junior college programs.

Unit II: The Junior College Curriculum

The curriculum is the main force within the junior college. It includes a complex of courses, programs, and subject matter, but all to the end that the students move toward the cognitive and affective goals of the college.

Unit II Goals: The student will understand the process of curricular development, change, and purpose. He will be able to validate course goals and understand and be able to apply the term "General Education" to courses and program.

Unit III: Goals and Objectives: Criteria and Classification

Objectives are the basic building blocks of the course, for through their use the instructor communicates specific expectations to his students. In this manner, direction is afforded and learning is facilitated. For the sake of clarification and communication within the whole field of education, the *Taxonomies*[a] were developed. The terms and concepts embodied in the *Taxonomies* have been widely adopted.

Unit III Goals: The student will be able to write goals which are appropriate for various chronological positions in the curriculum. He will be able to write specific, measurable objectives to be able to apply taxonomic classifications to educational objectives. He will also be able to organize objectives in logical order.

---

[a] Benjamin S. Bloom (ed.), *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives I: Cognitive Domain* (New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1956); David R. Krathwohl and others (eds.), *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives II: Affective Domain* (New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1964).

Unit IV: Tests and Assessments

Assessment of learning serves several purposes but primarily it determines the effect of the curriculum on each student. The ability to construct valid testing devices is prerequisite to all assessment procedures.

Unit IV Goals: The student will know the vocabulary of testing. He will understand the uses of preassessments and different types of tests and will understand principles of item analysis.

The student will be able to write test items which meet standards of clarity and direction for such items. He will understand the relationships among goals, objectives, and assessment procedures.

Unit V: Instructional Media and Design

All materials and methods are mediational influences of learning. In fact, any controllable influence intervening between the instructor's communication of objectives and his assessment of their attainment may be considered a medium of instruction. The selection of appropriate media from all that are available is an important task.

Unit V Goals: The student will be able to select appropriate instructional media, be able to apply criteria for selection of media to texts and programs.

He will design an autoinstructional program.

He will understand the principles of system design in education and be able to introduce those principles into junior college curricula where appropriate.

Unit VI: Building the Course

Carefully designed courses are essential to the process of curriculum. Within the course framework, the goals of the college become operable as learning is directed. Teacher-student interaction gains meaning when it is pointed toward particular ends.

Unit VI Goal: The student will design a complete course to be included in a junior college curriculum.

Each intern's course is developed from content and coverage suggested by course outlines on file in the junior college in which the intern will teach. Outlines are based on this format:

I. *Title Page.*
   - A. Catalogue number and title of course.
   - B. Name of instructor preparing outline.
   - C. Name of college.
   - D. Date of preparation.

II. *Course Description.* This should include:
   - A. Curricular placement: (Transfer, terminal—to what specific curriculum is the course assigned).
   - B. Time assignment: Hours per week, lecture, laboratory, or activity.

C. Description of student population (estimate).
   1. Ability levels of students.
   2. Institutions to which students transfer or occupation which they enter.
   3. Anticipated student dropout rate.

III. *Glossary.*
Definitions of terms used in objectives in the subject area (if appropriate).

IV. *Course Content.*
   A. Statement of major course objectives validated in terms of relationship to goals of the college.
   B. List of units or areas of instruction.
      1. List of unit titles.
      2. Time allotted for each unit.

V. *Materials of Instruction.*
   A. Statement of required texts and manuals.
   B. Bibliography of library materials.
   C. List of audio-visual materials: film slides, tapes, programmed instruction.

VI. *Organization of Each Unit of Instruction.*
   A. Statement of major concepts. (Tie with course on file with junior college dean.)
   B. Goals. List of specific measurable objectives.
      1. Type of behavior.
      2. Criterion of performance.
      Conditions of performance.
   C. Planned activities.
      1. The materials of instruction.
      2. Assignments to be made.
   D. Pre- and postassessment.
      1. Level of achievement intended.
      2. Sample test items.

VII. *Instructor's Evaluation.*
   A. Procedures for revising course.
   B. Provision for students who fail to meet level.

Unit VII: The Assessment of Curriculum and Instruction

The entire curriculum must be assessed periodically in light of changing populations and community needs or it is in danger of losing relevance. Similarly, each course within the curriculum needs regular inspection to insure that it continues to be appropriate. The assessment of curriculum, courses, and instructional achievement is a necessary, continuing process.

Unit VII Goals: The student will be able to report pupil progress toward specific objectives.

He will design appropriate procedures for assessing effects of junior college courses.

SEQUENCE OF OBJECTIVES

Each goal within each unit in the core course includes its own set of specific, measurable objectives. These objectives are arranged sequentially and range from those demanding simplest recall tasks to objectives which call for complex higher-order behaviors. The objectives logically tie to the goals. Whereas "The student will understand . . ." represents a process of mind, derived objectives state clearly what he will do to indicate his "understanding." A set of objectives stemming from one goal in Unit III will serve to illustrate:

Goal:	The student will be able to write specific, measurable objectives.	
Objective:	He will list and define in ten words or less the three criteria for specific objectives.	100%
	Given a list of objectives, he will distinguish between those which do and those which do not meet the criteria for specific objectives.	90%
	Given a list of objectives, he will note the reasons they fail to meet the criteria for specific objectives.	80%
	Given a general objective, he will restate it as an objective or objectives which meet the criteria for specific objectives.	80%
	Outside of class he will write one to three specific objectives which stem from each of the goals which he has previously submitted.	100%

In this example the student is led from the simple task of defining criteria for objectives through restating objectives to writing his own objectives. Each task carries its own minimum achievement standard which must be fulfilled before he moves to the next task. Goals and objectives are not simply "content" to be "covered." They are clear statements of abilities to be demonstrated. As such, they lend precise direction to course assignments and activities.

The course is constructed and planned so that it is consistent with the rationale of the program for preparing teachers at UCLA. The course, its goals, and its objectives, epitomize what is taught in it.

THE FIRST SEMESTER

After he has completed *The Junior College Curriculum* and before he begins teaching at the junior college, the intern meets with his supervisors for the purpose of planning the evaluation of his first year of teaching. Present at the conference are the college dean of instruction, the intern's department or division chairman, and a representative of the UCLA program (usually a professor). The intern presents the courses he proposes to teach and receives final approval for them. College representatives spell out expectations in the areas of professional involvement, college duties, and community service, and explain to the intern procedures for evaluating his work at the college. The UCLA program representative outlines procedures for university supervision during the intern year.

Although supervision provided the intern by the junior college varies, it is in all cases minimal. Upon occasion, an intern is put under the unofficial care of an experienced faculty member, who may tell him of the ways of the college and

provide "tips on teaching." Typically, however, interns do not affiliate with other instructors. In no case are interns treated as "practicing" or "cadet" teachers. Their status is that of regular, first-time instructors obligated to conform to college policies. Their orientation to the college is rarely more formal than an occasional group meeting with other beginning teachers and the dean of instruction or a division chairman.

In order to help interns in their first semester of teaching, UCLA offers seminars for them on alternate Saturdays. In the seminars, the interns give sample class presentations, discuss results achieved, and share ideas on why students have or have not learned according to their predictions. They gain ideas on procedures and methods from each other and from their professor. They modify their objectives and change their emphases according to the results they attain and the suggestions they receive.

The intern's teaching is thus supervised by indirection. By submitting scores made by his students on pre- and posttests and by bringing in copies of media he has employed, the university supervisor and he are able to plot together the best means of moving students toward his objectives. Predictions regarding numbers of students who will achieve certain scores on particular assessment devices are made and renegotiated periodically. The merits of the intern's procedures are considered by the seminar and suggestions are frequently made.

The first-semester seminar—along with the experience of teaching—is seen as a time of trial. Just as interns are encouraged to modify procedures in light of results obtained, they are expected to alter objectives on the basis of ideas gained after having confronted their students. During that semester, most interns reduce the number, scope, and complexity of their objectives as they realize the futility of attempting to move great numbers of students as far as they had anticipated. They try varied methods and techniques as they cast about for key ways to secure achievement on the part of their students. With the help of the seminar each intern makes new plans. At the close of the semester he prepares revised course outlines to fit the realities of his position.

THE SECOND SEMESTER MEETINGS

Meetings for the interns are held less frequently during the second semester. The group gets together formally only two or three times although interns are encouraged to attend other relevant events at UCLA, such as those called under the auspices of the Junior College Leadership Program. They continue, however, to submit to their professor at the university tests, scores, and written reports of their teaching. They may meet individually with the program director at any time for help in revising objectives or media.

During his second semester of teaching, the intern, using his revised objectives and methods, is increasingly more able to predict and to achieve success in learning. He attends faculty meetings at the college, serves on committees, and generally finds his place as a member of the staff. His continued tie with the program, however, helps insure that his attention is centered on the primary task—that of causing learning. At the close of the year, he once more submits

to his university professor outlines for the courses he teaches, revised for the last time so far as the university program is concerned. By this time, each intern has been launched in his particular teaching situation and has completed his obligations to the program of teacher preparation at the university.

The intern then begins his teaching experience in a junior college. He is not under direct supervision of a "master teacher." He is free to find his own best way of causing learning. He selects replicable media and uses them to the extent that they enhance his students' learning. He finds and uses methods which are most "comfortable" for him. As he adjusts to the realities of student abilities, he repeatedly revises his objectives and he communicates evidence of his own effect on his students. During the intern year, seminar sessions and conferences with his professor at UCLA help him to sharpen his skills, encourage him to try various techniques and allow him to experiment in association with fellow beginning teachers.

CHAPTER V

THE INTERNS

The UCLA Junior College Teaching Internship Program serves several purposes: it prepares people to teach in junior colleges, experiments with modes of teacher preparation, provides intellectual leadership and innovative ideas for the junior college movement, and conducts research on teachers and instructional processes. Its research function is furthered by university professors and graduate students who engage the interns in various types of investigations.

One line of research being conducted within the program attempts to shed light on various questions regarding people who enter junior college teaching—their diversity of background, their adaptability to preparation programs, and the relationships among various personality measures, and their relative success on the job. Reports of some of these continuing studies are available in the journal literature.[1] Another research study is considering the extent to which the interns adopt the premises on which the program is based—specifying objectives, selecting appropriate media, and gathering evidence of student learning.[2] These types of studies are important, both as basic research and as they contribute to modifications which may be made in the program, itself.

A third line of research—one which will be reported in this chapter—deals with backgrounds of the interns, their reactions to the program, and their situational success as it relates to placement on certain examinations and their abilities to "hold" students in their classes. Several questions lead to the data considered in this chapter. The junior college exerts a major influence upon vast numbers of people. It presents programs which are geared to widely divergent types of students enrolled for multitudinous reasons. Do junior college instructors exhibit heterogeneity to a degree that students are exposed to a variety of types of adults? Or are the men and women who teach in community colleges similar to each other in academic backgrounds and previous work experiences. How do UCLA interns score on examinations in which they compete with other applicants for teaching positions, including, in many instances, experienced teachers? Do junior college students tend to drop out of interns' courses? How do the interns, themselves, feel about their experiences in the program?

---

[1] Florence B. Brawer and Arthur M. Cohen, "Global and Sign Approaches to Rorschach Assessment of Beginning Teachers," *Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment*, XXX, 6 (1966), 536–542; Arthur M. Cohen and Florence B. Brawer, "Adaptive Potential and First-Year Teaching Success," *Journal of Teacher Education*, XVIII, 2 (Summer 1967), 179–185.

[2] John J. Friboda, "A Followup Study of Graduates of the University of California, Los Angeles, Junior College Teacher Preparation Programs" (dissertation in progress, University of California, Los Angeles, School of Education).

SELECTION

Candidates for UCLA junior college teaching internships in 1964 through 1967 were recruited through word of mouth, through the UCLA Educational Placement Office, and by means of direct response to posters which had been distributed on the campus. In all cases, the candidates might be said to have selected themselves.

Each applicant to the program was interviewed by representatives of the placement office as well as by the director of the internship program and his staff. Those who appeared to be unlikely teaching prospects (because, for example, of blatant personality problems or extreme physical disabilities which would render their attaining positions extremely unlikely) and/or those who failed to meet intellectual and academic entrance requirements were eliminated. Others, who were considered to be likely prospects, were given information about specific junior colleges seeking teachers in their fields of concentration. These men and women worked directly with the placement office and the community colleges to secure positions as teachers for the following academic year, a procedure which also served as a further screening device. From the more than 120 applicants who initially sought positions as junior college interns, forty-six were selected in the three-year period with which this report is concerned. These forty-six interns are the subjects for this study.

Our discussion here will be concerned with information submitted by students at the time they applied for membership in the UCLA program. Data will be considered in terms of academic backgrounds, age, experiences prior to application, and major areas of study. Stemming from the knowledge that junior colleges are unique educational institutions with students representing a many-faceted population, and developed upon the rationale that exposure to different people broadens one's awareness of both self and others, this material attempts to aid in answering the question: Is the heterogeneity of students in junior colleges matched by the heterogeneity of beginning teachers—as represented by UCLA interns in junior college teaching?

Another consideration regarding junior college faculty is the relationships among colleagues. In a current study of issues and problems affecting faculty members in junior colleges throughout the country, Garrison suggests that job satisfaction results at least in part from "regular opportunities for dialogue with colleagues . . . (and) for continued growth and intellectual stimulation."[6] If this is, indeed, an important feature in junior college life and teaching, it would apparently be important that there exist in the junior colleges a variety of interesting, interested, stimulating, bright people in all fields. If intern programs can provide diverse people with excellent and varied backgrounds, the junior college faculty would appear to be helped in more extensive ways than if programs merely sent "good teachers" to the schools. The forty-six people who became interns in the UCLA Junior College Teaching Internship Program represent but a small and highly selected number of those individuals who enter the teaching profession each year. However, the differences in academic and vocational backgrounds and the academic achievements of these students are of interest.

[6] Roger Garrison, *Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967).

ACADEMIC BACKGROUNDS

A basic requirement for entrance into the internship program was possession of the master's degree in an academic subject field. Before receiving both this graduate degree and the bachelor's degree, nine of the forty-six subjects had also received the Associate of Arts (AA) degree from a California junior college. Thus, approximately 19 per cent of these interns were entering the teaching profession by acting as instructors in schools similar to ones they had previously attended.

Table I presents the degrees held by the junior college teaching interns. Several students also reported course credits beyond the master's degree, though

TABLE I

DECREES HELD BY JUNIOR COLLEGE TEACHING INTERNS

Degree	Number held
AA	9
BA	23
BS	11
BCE	1
Not specified	1
MA	23
MS	7
MBA	3
M Engineering	2
MSW	1
M Library Science	1

N = 46.

short of the doctorate. Knowledge about the schools at which these degrees were earned provides further information regarding diversity in the academic backgrounds of the interns. The colleges from which interns earned degrees vary in geographical location, size, and educational focus. Table II presents the distribution of schools for the Associate of Arts degrees, the bachelor's degrees, and the master's degrees. For the nine two-year degrees held by the interns, five schools were represented. These were all California community colleges. Whether our subjects chose to return to such institutions of higher education because they valued their own earlier experiences or whether they were preparing to return because they hoped to improve the quality of education to which they had been exposed, is not presently known.

ACADEMIC MAJORS

The major fields of concentration for both the bachelor's and the master's degrees are presented in Table III, where a total of seventeen areas are represented. Since candidates for the internship program were hired after initial

TABLE II

SCHOOLS AT WHICH DEGREES WERE EARNED

No. of Degrees Granted	School for A.A. Degree	Number	School for Bachelor's Degree	Number	School for Master's Degree
4	El Camino Junior College	17	University of California, Los Angeles	31	University of California, Los Angeles
2	Los Angeles City College	5	University of California, Berkeley	3	University of Southern California
1	College of the Sequoias	2	Brooklyn College	2	University of California, Berkeley
1	Glendale College	2	New York University	2	New York University
1	Santa Monica City College	2	University of Southern California	1	California State, Fullerton
9		1	Bradley University	1	Immaculate Heart College
		1	Chestnut Hill College	1	Los Angeles City College
		1	Cooper Union	1	San Diego State College
		1	Immaculate Heart College	1	San Fernando Valley State College
		1	LaVerne College	1	University of Illinois
		1	Long Beach State College	1	University of Nevada
		1	Loyola University	1	University of Pennsylvania
		1	Pomona College	46	
		1	Saint Charles Seminary		
		1	Saint John's University		
		1	Stanford University		
		1	State College of Washington		
		1	University of Chicago		
		1	University of Colorado		
		1	University of Michigan		
		1	University of Nevada		
		1	Whittier College		
		1	Not Designated		
		46			

TABLE III

MAJOR FIELDS OF CONCENTRATION

Subject Area	Number of Bachelor's Degrees	Number of Master's Degrees	Total
Accounting	1	1	2
Botany	0	1	1
Business Administration	3	3	6
Chemistry	1	1	2
Economics	1	1	2
English	15	14	29
Engineering	4	2	6
French	2	1	3
History	2	1	3
Home Economics	1	0	1
Journalism	1	3	4
Latin American Studies	1	1	2
Library Service	0	1	1
Mathematics	2	2	4
Philosophy	1	1	2
Physics	1	1	2
Political Science	3	2	5
Psychology	2	1	3
Sociology-Social Work	4	5	9
Speech	0	2	2
Theater Arts	0	2	2
Not Designated	1	0	1
	46	46	92

screening and prior to participation in the program, academic subject concentration was really a reflection of the requirements of the junior colleges at the time the interns applied for positions. Occasionally an intern was hired to teach a subject, or subjects, other than his major—his minor field of concentration, perhaps, or an allied area. Usually, however, suggestion of the major area represents the teaching positions open at the time the candidates were hired.

HONORARY ORGANIZATIONS

Membership in an honorary society may imply either a bright but primarily pedantic individual who repeats what he has routinely learned or a highly able and frequently independent, creative student. It further suggests that the individual member of such-and-such a society has fulfilled certain requirements deemed prerequisite to entering the organization, and that, from the total eligible student body, that person has been selected along with special others. Several interns are members of one or more honorary societies, many in specialized fields —sociology, journalism, engineering, and the like. Some students also noted that

TABLE IV

MEMBERSHIP IN HONORARY SOCIETIES

Number of Memberships	Organization
45	General academic honorary societies
6	Special scholarships, fellowships, deans lists
3	Graduated "*cum laude*"
6	Phi Beta Kappa
60	

Note: Several interns indicated membership in more than one honorary society.

they had graduated "*cum laude*" while others acquired scholarships or made the dean's list. Still other interns reported membership in Phi Beta Kappa.

Table IV presents the total numbers of honorary organizations in which the interns reported affiliation and the number of designated memberships in Phi Beta Kappa. If stimulation among colleagues is increased by association with academically able people who have achieved recognition through memberships in honorary organizations, the junior colleges whose faculties include instructors with backgrounds similar to those of our interns must, indeed, be stimulating institutions in which to work.

TABLE V

AGE AND SEX OF INTERNS

Year	Sex	Number of Subjects	Age Range	Median Age
1964-1965	Male	8	25-30	28
" "	Female	1	40	40
" "	Total	9	25-30	28
1965-1966	Male	14	22-44	28.5
" "	Female	6	25-47	40.5
" "	Total	20	22-47	29
1966-1967	Male	9	25-54	35.5
" "	Female	8	23-47	36
" "	Total	17	23-47	32
Total No. of Subjects		46	22-54	29
				40

AGE AND SEX

Still other ways of describing the interns involved in the UCLA junior college program are in terms of age and sex. Of the total forty-six subjects, there were thirty men and sixteen women. Ages for the total group of forty-six interns ranged from twenty-two to fifty-four years, with a median age of twenty-nine. This distribution may be further classified by separating the subjects into the years in which they acted as teaching interns. Table V shows such a division, describing age ranges and median ages.

WORK EXPERIENCE

Some interns entered the program directly from college and university studies with newly acquired master's degrees and with little or no previous work experience but others had had an extensive employment background. Although backlog of time invested in several fields is considered to be an asset, one of the requirements for entrance into the program was that applicants have either a minimal or no experience as professional teachers. Several interns had served

TABLE VI

PREVIOUS WORK EXPERIENCE DESIGNATED BY TEACHING INTERNS

Occupation	Number of Interns Indicating This Area
Actress	1
Air Force Officer	1
Auto-tour Counselor	1
Book Company Buyer	1
Camp Counselor	2
Construction Coordinator	1
Department Store Buyer	1
Director of Customer Relations	1
Editor, Writer	4
Employment Security Officer	1
Engineer	3
Juvenile Hall Group Counselor	1
Librarian	1
Not Specified	8
Priest	1
Probation Officer	1
Recreation Worker	2
Rehabilitation and Marriage Counselor	1
Social Worker	4
Speech Therapist	1
*Teacher	1
Teaching Assistant, Research Assistant or Reader	13
Technical Writer, Editor	3

* One intern, briefly described previously, reported teaching experience many years earlier; she was the only exception to the "no-teaching" requirement for program participants.

as graduate teaching assistants or as part-time instructors while they worked on graduate degrees, but only one intern had actually been employed as a full-time teacher, many years previously. She was the one participant who completed all program requirements but refused to supply follow-up information after she had assumed her responsibilities as a junior college teacher.

Because many of the subjects were older than the usual "student teacher," and had thus been out of college for some years before entering the internship program, a considerable amount of experience in areas other than pedagogy was reported. The occupations reported by the subjects are shown in Table VI. In a few instances, an intern had spent an equal amount of time in two fields and saw fit to report both of these. Positions as teachers and research assistants were considered to be student jobs, but when these were especially indicated by the respondents, who thereby emphasized their felt importance, they were tabulated. For the younger subjects, these "student jobs" were frequently the only positions previously held.

The several areas of designated work experiences follow the general pattern that seems to be developing in regard to the people who elected to become teaching interns in the junior college program. They are a diverse group of people with excellent and varied backgrounds. This pattern establishes no one major focus but points to a multitude of foci; it reveals no one type of background, but a variety of backgrounds. With these varied academic and vocational backgrounds, the interns might well be representative of many individuals who approach the new task of teaching in junior colleges without having had previous teaching experience.

TABLE VII

PLACEMENT OF INTERNS ON SUBJECT-AREA EXAMINATION

Rank	No. of Students Placing in This Category
1	6
2	7
3	2
5	2
7	1
13	2
14	1
15	2
18	1
28	1
32	1
39	1
Disqualified	2
Eliminated	1
Unsuccessful	1

N = 31

CITY EXAMINATION PLACEMENTS

Although candidates may be employed to teach in junior colleges in the Los Angeles City School District before taking certain examinations, satisfactory scores on these tests are essential for continuing employment. These examinations test knowledge of and teaching techniques in specialized subject areas; for example—business, management, and finance; philosophy; theater arts.

Of the forty-six subjects who comprise our three groups of interns, thirty-one took the Los Angeles City School Examinations at some point during their intern year. Unfortunately, information is not available regarding the total number of teachers taking each examination; therefore, placement scores are presented only in terms of actual rank rather than in percentile ranks. Table VII presents the positions attained by each of these thirty-one subjects. All but four interns placed successfully on the examinations, with many ranking first and second on the exams in their subject areas. Particularly outstanding were the four interns in English who, in winter 1966, took first, second, fifth, and eighteenth positions among 150 people who took the eligibility examination in that subject area.

HOLDING POWER

Research on college student dropouts has continued over a period of more than forty years, and yet attrition rates are still notoriously high. In the junior college, these rates are frequently even greater than they are for higher education as a whole. Although many investigators have been systematically concerned with general attrition factors, the questions of holding powers of particular teachers has not been resolved. Is there a relationship between certain teachers and their students which may be expressed in terms of hold or drop-figures? Is one type of teacher more likely to have a greater number of dropouts than another? How does the beginning teacher's drop rate compare to that of an experienced instructor in similar courses? Does youthful enthusiasm have a greater holding power than age and experience? And, finally, where does the junior college intern stand as far as attrition rates are concerned when he compares to all teachers in his school who instruct in similar courses?

In an effort to answer these questions, the 1965–1966 junior college interns were asked to respond to a brief questionnaire which called for specific information about the number of students initially enrolled in their classes and the number enrolled at the end of the semester. Similarly, deans of instruction were asked to provide attrition figures for all sections of the same course taught by all teachers in the same year. These attempts to secure data were not completely successful. Some junior colleges were reluctant to disclose their drop rates on grounds that "the confidential nature of this material protects the individual teacher." Several interns reported that they did not have complete records. And, when schools did report data, they grouped all teachers together—younger and older, beginning and experienced. Therefore, comparisons which could be made were, at best, very general.

Table VIII presents the material gathered from nine participating schools and from seventeen interns of the 1965–1966 group. Thirty-one different classes

or sections of similar classes represented ten general fields. It may be seen that the average attrition rate for the interns' classes was 22.5 per cent while the average attrition rate for all classes combined in the same field for all teachers in that same school was 20.7 per cent. Intern drop rates were higher in seven classes; lower in three classes. The greatest discrepancy between the interns' reported drop and that given by all teachers was in the library science classes where the reported difference was 27 per cent in favor of the intern. Political science

TABLE VIII

ATTRITION RATES IN INTERN CLASSES AND IN SIMILAR CLASSES CONDUCTED BY ALL TEACHERS

Class	Per Cent Intern Drop Rate	Per Cent All Teachers Drop Rate	Difference
Biology	27	23	4
English (assorted)	28	23	5
History	20	18	2
Journalism	25	27	− 2
Library Science	17	44	−27
Mathematics	30	24	6
Political Science	26	9	17
Physics	14	21	− 7
Sociology	26	12	14
Speech	12	6	6
	225	207	
Average percent	22.5	20.7	

Total No. of Different Courses.. = 31
Total No. of Fields..... = 10
Total No. of Interns Responding = 17

classes accounted for a difference of 17 per cent for all classes. It would thus appear that while the attrition rates are not as high as reported for some schools as a whole (and not as low as others suggest), the drops in intern classes are fairly comparable to those of all teachers. While the interns did not, therefore, achieve notably lower drop figures, they nonetheless were able to hold their own in comparison with both new and experienced teachers taken as a whole.

COMMENTS

Our final attempt to describe the junior college teaching interns is in terms of their own expressed feelings regarding the program and their experiences as beginning teachers. These reactions occurred chiefly in response to a questionnaire dealing with the courses which the interns were building in their schools. This inquiry was geared to ascertaining whether interns were using the defined-objectives focus, seen as the primary thrust in their training course, and

to their future plans. Their comments seem to better illustrate the impact of the UCLA Junior College Teaching Internship Program upon the interns themselves than any further discussion could possibly indicate.

One intern wrote:

Each semester of a course seems to need to be planned anew . . . I found only the broadest objectives workable . . . Often my most successful course meetings are planned only grossly: we might be working toward an objective of using more detail in writing, and the day's activity would be identifying the kinds of detail in the assigned reading . . . I miss the *sense of feeling* directed by my objectives but I recognize that the class is organic and perhaps not at its best when thoroughly structured.

From one of the women:

The course was worthwhile. I am presently getting a Ph.D. at Columbia and hope to use what I learned in the internship program when I teach at a four-year college.

Another highly rated intern felt the greatest difficulties in building a course around specific objectives was "the disparity in capability level of the typical JC class. This, I feel, presents the most characteristic challenge of JC instruction." He further suggested that:

Objectives afford a teacher a constant direction, purpose and perspective. He may change and alter his local or immediate number objectives but his broader objectives lend him substance and keep him always within a valid framework . . . It is difficult, at best, to formulate the "perfect" program seeking answers (for one is easily perplexed, never having taught before), and he gets rather questions [in the intern training program]. This approach is unsettling and somewhat disenchanting, but I think it assumes a greater validity *after* the intern starts his actual teaching. For then he realizes . . . he must utimately turn to his own creative resources and energies with a consistent awareness of objectives underlying his direction. Thus in a final sense, I think the most conspicuous value within the program lay in the attempts to encourage the intern to question and examine and investigate his own latent resources within an objective framework, rather than to cling to the more immediate comforts of answers, for there is no common manner which all teachers can share other than the desire to evolve in the student a state of consciousness larger than that which he entered the class with, and the manner in which this is done can be as diverse as the personalities of the teachers who do it.

Still another intern reported:

I intend changing objectives whenever I find more meaningful material to replace them with. Also, I intend developing specific objectives for "B" and "A" students. At present I only have specific objectives to cover minimum requirements.

From an intern who was not rehired to teach in the following year:

I hope you will develop your program along lines which will not emphasize a need to specify specific and general objectives. There are other things to consider beyond the spurious rigor to which you are so passionately attracted.

Another intern wrote:

[Your questionnaire] reminds me again, with pleasure, of the summer on the internship program. The class was perfectly useful to me. I have meant to write thanks many times. The most useful thing was your program director's example of moderation in teaching; it seems to work well at all levels.

From a particularly outstanding teacher of mathematics:

There were two dissatisfactions that arose . . . our inability to plan a course properly and therefore course outlines were put together with much grumbling. Now that I have taught I feel it is impossible to construct a course properly until you have taught one similar to it . . . We were [also] bothered by the fact that we hadn't learned how to *teach*. We began to realize that ones does not learn to teach by a step 1, step 2, step 3 process.

. . . Fifteen hours a week is a heavy load for a new teacher. Long hours were spent every night in preparation for the next day's classes. Teaching took all my strength and concentration . . . planning something special for one class would not allow enough time for preparation for the others . . . I didn't have a very good idea of how much the students could learn and how fast . . . My first year of teaching . . . was an exciting, rewarding and happy year for me. Teaching is more strenuous than I thought it could possibly be . . .

The Universities do not consider teaching as the primary function of their staff and this demoralizing attitude has communicated itself to all higher education. Lower division students suffer the most since these students need good teachers. The Universities do not realize the importance of training teachers at all except, of course, in the Education Department . . . What do Junior college teachers need? They need mental stimulation in their own field of interest. They need to discuss new ideas in education. They need to be encouraged and supported in attempting to bring about worthwhile changes.

. . . Perhaps you can't "train" a college teacher. Why is it that some colleges are outstanding in lower division education and others are poor? The immediate reply is: "The students are better." What nonsense! The teachers are better. A program to prepare lower division teachers for their new responsibilities and to make them aware of what the superior teacher is doing in his classroom is an important need in our system and a need the internship program is trying to fill.

And from one of the more expressive interns, who was apparently still enjoying her own "soul searching":

Being myself a product of the lecture system, I assumed that teaching meant primarily lecturing. What knowledge I had gained with sweat and pleasure, I would impart with fervor to roomsful of eager students. When I had fantasies about myself as a teacher, I heard myself deliver lectures that were a composite of all the most brilliant lectures I had ever listened to.

That seems comical now, but I might have stumbled along that worn-out path for a long time if the Junior College Internship Program had not made me aware that there is a difference between teaching and learning. The shift in my attitude from "how can I best express what I have learned" to "how can I help the student learn this" had changed my whole concept of what school, at any level, is all about. I have discovered that if you want learning to be accomplished by students, you must use every device, every aid, every last scrap of attention and insight and imagination that you have.

Last semester I tried a mixture of specific objectives and Socratic-type dialogue; next semester I'm going to try for even more involvement on the part of each student. I already know there is no straight, royal road that leads to helping someone to learn, but I am everlastingly grateful to the internship program for jarring me off that narrow dead-end I was prepared to travel. I still blush and cringe a little when I remember those brilliant-lecture fantasies.

In summary, the follow-up data gathered as part of the research activities concerned with the UCLA junior college teaching interns gives us a further picture of the kinds of people involved in this program. Not only do they present variety in background but they would appear to be generally adept in handling

the subject matter in their respective fields of concentration. The six teachers ranking first and the seven who ranked second in their special examinations suggest that these interns were more than adequately prepared to handle the subject matter which they were attempting to transmit to their students.

The information on attrition, while limited, suggests further that the interns, as beginning teachers, were able to hold their own when compared to both experienced and new teachers comprising the "all-teacher" groups. Considerably more research is needed on the entire question of dropouts and on the holding power of certain types or groups of teachers. The information which has been gathered on this problem during the course of our research with the interns is encouraging in the sense that it shows first-time teachers to be about as effective at holding students as the teaching group taken as a whole. However, it raises more questions than it attempts to answer, and these would seem to point to a considerable need for further investigations.

Finally, the comments from the interns regarding both the UCLA program and their new experiences were, for the most part, encouraging. While it is true that the validity of a statement cannot be established from a subjective reaction regarding a participant's experiences, it should be noted that many of the comments were offered voluntarily. Therefore, we tend to believe that the interns were sincere in their responses and were seriously involved in offering comments and suggestions which would best represent their own feelings and reactions. In establishing other programs, these comments may provide guidelines which would both enhance teacher preparation programs and would lead to better understanding, on the parts of school of education personnel and junior college teaching supervisors, of the feelings of teachers at various rated levels of effectiveness.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CRITIQUE

A teacher preparation program does not exist in isolation. Rather, it exerts influence on, and is influenced by, societal contexts—those of the university in which it is housed, of the schools its serves, of the people it attempts to shape, and of the theories current in its disciplines.

At the time the Junior College Teaching Internship Program was launched, UCLA was involved in a project concerned with the development of innovative modes of teacher preparation. The University had received a grant from the Ford Foundation which provided funds to develop and experiment with new procedures and rationales for the preparation of teachers. The School of Education recognized the importance of such experimentation because it was consistent with the School's commitment to take leadership in the preparation of teachers and also to expand knowledge through research. Staff members interpreted their task as being one of translating theory into practice in actual school situations through trying out and evaluating a variety of innovative ideas in teacher preparation programs.

HISTORY AND RATIONALE

As the 1960's opened, California junior colleges were consolidating a position of strength gained over fifty years of development. Their contributions to the state's educational structure were diverse and comprehensive. Almost a half-million students were enrolled in programs of general education, vocational-technical education, community service, remedial studies, and university-parallel work. As an educational force, the two-year colleges were having a powerful impact on the communities in which they were located. The nature of their identity, was, however, in question because of the multiplicity of their commitments and because of their modes of operation. They were "higher education" to the extent that they offered university-parallel and postsecondary work; they were "technical institutes" to the extent that they offered vocational training; they were "community servants" in that they offered something for everyone in their communities; and they were "public school" because they offered remedial work in basic skills. Their instructional practices were, for the most part, modeled on those found in universities and in secondary schools throughout the country.

Faculty members were being attracted to junior colleges from a variety of sources. Most teachers came from high schools or from teacher education programs oriented toward "methods and techniques" of teaching. The *Licensing of*

Certificated Personnel Law of 1961[1] and subsequent amendments resulted, by early 1966, in a situation in which a person might be hired as a junior college instructor with only a master's degree in an academic subject area (or with comparable vocational training) and with no formal pedagogical preparation. Nonetheless, there was a moderate shortage of teachers in some fields and some oversupply in others. Furthermore, junior colleges, claiming to be "teaching institutions," made continual calls for "good teachers."

Any program of teacher education must have a focus, a reason for being. Basically, if its purpose is to supply bodies to staff the schools, the services of a research-oriented graduate school of education are unnecessary. If its purpose is to make a lasting impact upon the people it serves and upon the institutions in which they will labor, it must direct its efforts toward some vision of desired behavior to be exercised by the people who pass through it and toward some vision of the nature of practices to be employed by the instructors in the institutions it serves. It must recognize that a teacher preparation program cannot do everything. It can't, for example, restructure the personalities of the people who participate in it. It can't teach its clients all possible procedures to be followed by them in the various institutions in which they will be employed. It can, however, eliminate parochial and short-range, soon-to-be-obsolescent procedures, and focus attention on those things a teacher must know and do in order to make his own particular, effective contribution.

The UCLA program took as its point of emphasis the extent of learning to be achieved by junior college students. It attempted to influence learning by turning the attention of teachers-in-preparation toward defining the nature of that learning, predicting the extent of it, bringing it about, and assessing it. It attempted to motivate instructors to take responsibility for that learning. Nothing contained in this rationale required drastic restructuring of programs in the University or of practices in the junior college. The focus just described was necessary, however, if the program were to lead teachers to accept responsibility for student learning and if it were to encourage junior colleges to support teachers in that endeavor. This rationale represented less a radical departure from previous practices than a valid philosophical focal point for the program.

The program derived its thrust from five general purposes of the University and of the School of Education: (1) a role in preparing people for service in professions; (2) a charge to offer intellectual leadership to the educational community; (3) a commitment to advance the frontiers of knowledge through research; (4) an obligation to translate findings of research in learning into changed practices in the schools; and (5) a desire on the part of professors particularly interested in the junior college to help that segment of education define its role by lending direction to the movement.

PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION

One of the major functions of the University is helping prepare people for service in professions. This is in accordance with its commitments to serve both students as individuals and society at large. Students gain professional training

[1] California Education Code, Article 1.5 of Chapter 2 of Division 10.

and the opportunity to enter rewarding forms of employment. Society acquires skilled practitioners to carry on the necessary work of the community.

The UCLA School of Education programs derive from these general functions of the University in that they are designed for school and college instructors, counselors, and administrators, current or prospective, who must have certain skills in order to serve effectively in their respective positions. The internship program particularly provides service to junior colleges by offering new ideas to them and new people to labor in them. It similarly provides service to graduate students who wish the enter the junior college teaching profession.

Students desirous of entering the profession are afforded guidance, placement, and training through the program. The fact that candidates must have positions as full- or part-time instructors open to them in advance of their enrollment in the program stems from a belief that it is a waste of resources to train people who will, in actuality, not serve in the capacity for which they were prepared.

The core course taken by all interns focuses on the teaching-learning paradigm because learning is the overriding purpose of the junior college movement. The course eliminates those aspects of the teacher's position which are considered to be better handled in in-service sequences and in orientations provided at the junior colleges. Upon completion of the course, interns have built their own courses and have thus created frames of reference for themselves. Accordingly, when they embark upon their careers, they are more likely to have a definite purpose, focus, and direction of their own. Each course is complete with specific objectives and assessment procedures spelled out so that the intern may become both hypothesis maker and tester.

During the intern year the neophyte teacher meets with his fellows for two general purposes: (1) to report gains achieved by his students and (2) to be helped with problems usually faced by people embarking on a new profession. He submits rebuilt courses twice—once at the end of his first semester and again at the end of the intern year. By arranging with his immediate supervisors at the junior college for advance determination of the criteria on which he will be evaluated, the program attempts to eliminate mystery as to what he is expected to do. That uncertaintly is perhaps the single greatest cause of teacher failure.[2]

By the end of the intern year, the neophyte teacher has a basic knowledge of his own ability to bring about learning on the part of his students. He has observed others teach and has evaluated them on their ability to plot courses and to attain results. He has served on committees at the college and has, in a sense, reconciled his academic discipline with his new situation as a member of a professional community.

The program's emphasis on preteaching identification of criteria for evaluation involves the junior college as a fellow participant with the University in preparing its own teachers. The agreement made between the intern and the junior college administrators usually may be subdivided into three broad areas—

[2] Roy G. Mikalson, "The Impact of 1961 Legislation Relating to Probationary Teachers on Instruction and Administrative Practices in California Public Junior Colleges" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1964).

service to school and community, involvement in the teacher's own discipline and professional service, and changing students. In that fashion the UCLA program and the junior college administrators help to communicate to the intern the nature of his responsibilities. He learns what is and is not important at the college and is spared some of the uncertainties attendant upon one's entering a completely new situation.

In essence, the program attempts to change the emphasis in teaching from teachers' activities to students' changed behaviors. It moves from the practice of viewing a teacher as one playing an ascribed role to a focus on results obtained. The training sequence is designed to avoid suggesting imitation of other teachers but to allow each instructor to find his own best way of bringing about learning. In the program, no one method of instruction is sacred. The teacher is seen as empiricist and is encouraged to change procedures whenever necessary to achieve specified results. He moves from looking at his own activities to assessing attainment of objectives and to introducing self-correction on the basis of feedback. The program takes teachers from a preexisting desire to test students for the purpose of *sorting* them to a procedure whereby they sample students' *learning*. It is designed to transmit the understanding that information is to be found everywhere. The teacher is not seen as one who goes to the pool of knowledge and draws out portions for his students to taste, but as the designer of learning paths leading to deliberate ends.

PROBLEMS

There are several problems associated with the program's attempt to change people and procedures. One of these is the disciplinary orientation of academic preparation experienced by students entering the program. Many students enroll in the program convinced that the achievements of their disciplines represent certitude on a cosmic scale; they wish only to apprise their own students of that fact. They may have selected themselves to become teachers because they held a vision of a teacher-model interacting with his students. They may have seen the teacher as a walking encyclopaedia—as "one who knows" rather than as one who exists for the purpose of causing learning. The fact that they are to be held accountable for learning achieved by their students represents a new, alien, often disruptive concept.

A second problem is the fact that although the program attempts to prepare teachers to cause learning, reward systems presently extant in junior colleges are not based on—and in fact conflict with—that rationale. The program is, therefore, in the anomalous position of deliberately preparing teachers to act one way while junior colleges often recognize and reward them for acting in other ways. For example, junior colleges typically evaluate teachers on the basis of their observed performance in their classrooms. Little attempt is made to gather evidence indicative of the fact that students have or have not learned as a result of teachers' endeavors. This cycle of reward or punishment on the basis of what the *teacher* does is one which has a negative influence on the program's impact.

Occasional Reports from UCLA Junior College Leadership Program:

1. Frederick C. Kintzer. *Faculty Handbooks in California Public Junior Colleges* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 1). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1961. Price, $1.00.

2. Frederick C. Kintzer. *Board Policy Manuals in California Public Junior Colleges* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 2). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1962. Price, $1.00.

3. *Institutional Research in the Junior College—A Report of a Conference* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 3). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1962. Price, $1.50.

4. Frederick C. Kintzer. *President's Report in American Junior Colleges* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 4). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1963. Price, $1.50.

5. *Establishing Junior Colleges* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 5). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1964. Price, $1.50.

6. B. Lamar Johnson, *Islands of Innovation* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 6). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1964. Price, $1.00.

7. B. Lamar Johnson, ed. *New Directions for Instruction in the Junior College* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 7). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1965. Price, $2.00.

8. B. Lamar Johnson, ed. *The Junior College Library* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 8). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1966. Price, $2.00.

9. B. Lamar Johnson, ed. *Systems Approaches to Curriculum and Instruction in the Open-Door College* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 9). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1967. Price, $2.00.

10. Ervin L. Harlacher. *Effective Junior College Programs of Community Services: Rationale, Guidelines, Practices* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 10). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1967. Price, $2.00.

11. Arthur M. Cohen, in collaboration with Florence B. Brawer. *Focus on Learning: Preparing Teachers for the Two-Year College* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 11). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1968. Price, $2.00.

For Sale by UCLA Students' Store